THE

LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

Volume 17 November, 1935 Number 11

THE WAR ELECTION

—R.P.D.

PRICE SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ORDER NOW

ENGELS & SCIENCE

By J. D. BERNAL **16 pages** **2d. (Now Ready)**

Rates for Quantities :
1/6 per dozen ; 3/2 for 25 (3/8 post free) ; 6/2 for 50 (6/9 post free)

Also owing to a steadily persisting demand a **Fourth Reprinting** (13,000 already sold) of

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM AND COMMUNISM

By L. RUDAS **44 pages** **6d.**

has been decided upon **(Ready Shortly)**

Rates for Quantities :
4/6 per dozen : 9/6 for 25 (10/2 post free) : 18/8 for 50 (20/- post free)

THE MANAGER, THE LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 John Street London, W.C. 1.

A South of England Labour Monthly Conference against

WAR & FASCISM

Saturday, Dec. 7th, at 2-45 p.m.

IN THE

FORESTERS HALL, FRATTON STREET, PORTSMOUTH

Chairman : **R. S. BALL** (Secretary, Hants, Dorset and Isle of Wight Federation of Trades Councils)

Speakers : **DOROTHY WOODMAN** (Secretary, Union of Democratic Control ; Prospective Labour Candidate for Wood Green).
D. NAYSMITH, J.P., (President, Portsea Island Co-operative Society).

SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION :

(1) **The Italian Fascist War of Aggression on Abyssinia and How to Stop It.**
(2) **The Prospects of the Fight against War and Fascism after the General Election.**
(3) **The Problem of building 100% Trade Unionism in the South.**
(4) **The Direct and Indirect attacks on the Consumers Co-operative Movement.**

Readers are urged to send in names and addresses of any organisation they consider should be invited to this Conference and any suggestions as to the above proposed agenda to THE MANAGER, THE LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.I.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 17 NOVEMBER, 1935 NUMBER 11

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

CONTENTS

The Financial Appeal - - - - - Page 651

Notes of the Month - - - - - „ 653
THE WAR ELECTION
By R. P. D.

The Socialists, the War and the General Election „ 668
By J. R. CAMPBELL

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International (*concluded*) - - - - „ 679
By HARRY POLLITT

A Decisive Step to World Trade Union Unity - „ 685
By W. ZAK

Cotton and the Left: A Reply to the Fascist Quarterly - - - - - - - - „ 691
By WILLIAM RUST

The Background to the Canadian Elections - „ 697
By CANADIAN OBSERVER

Correspondence:
On the Nature of the Capitalist Crisis - „ 703
By "INTERESTED"

Book Reviews - - - - - - - - „ 707
An Indictment of the Government's Health Policy - *By* "M.D."
Enthusiastic but Still Lacking Understanding - - *By* Alick West
Housing in Manchester - - - - - *By* E.R.
A Study of African Dancing - - - - *By* W.F.

Published at

7 JOHN STREET, Theobald's Road, LONDON, W.C.1.

A

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Offices :
7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.
Telephone : HOLBORN 6656

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him or undertake to enter into correspondence regarding rejected contributions, although every endeavour will be made to return the same when a stamped and addressed envelope for that purpose is enclosed.

1935 : *Subscription Rates*
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

British Isles :

One year - 7/- Six months - 3/6

Abroad :

One year 8/- or $2.00 Six months 4/- or $1.00

American Subscription Representative :—Philip Novick, 270 Broadway, Suite 1401, New York City, U.S.A.

The Labour Monthly is also obtainable wholesale from The Workers' Bookshop, 38 Clerkenwell Green, E.C.1.

Advertisement Rates : £8 8s. od. per cover page and pro rata. £5 5s. od. per page (ordinary position) and pro rata (⅛th page minimum).

BOUND VOLUMES

Volume I	£5 0s. 0d.	*Volume IX*	£1 1s. 0d.
Volume II	£3 3s. 0d.	*Volume X*	15s. 0d.
Volume III	£3 3s. 0d.	*Volume XI*	15s. 0d.
Volume IV	£3 3s. 0d.	*Volume XII*	10s. 6d.
Volume V	£2 2s. 0d.	*Volume XIII*	10s. 6d.
Volume VI	£1 10s. 0d.	*Volume XIV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VII	£1 10s. 0d.	*Volume XV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VIII	£1 1s. 0d.	*Volume XVI*	10s. 6d.

Loose copies of last five volumes can be exchanged for a bound volume for 4s. 6d. Single loose copies are available of almost every issue of *The Labour Monthly* since 1921.

The articles in *The Labour Monthly* are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A. as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Financial Appeal

THIS month £10 14s. 4d. has been sent in towards the Debt Fund. This makes a somewhat better showing than last month and we are especially glad to welcome an increase in the number of contributors. Will readers who are paying their subscriptions please note that whenever they are able they should adopt the practice of sending the LABOUR MONTHLY whenever possible a round figure of at least 10s. or a £1, so that the change can go towards swelling the Debt Fund.

As we said last month this winter should see the Debt Fund completely cleared if readers will realise the serious position in which the LABOUR MONTHLY is placed.

We have still to pay off another £200 odd. Unless we can get an increased rate than at present, this £200 will increase, because the £18 at which the Guarantee Fund stands at present is not sufficient to cover the £28 monthly deficit which is being incurred.

The full statement which we hoped to publish this month of the exact position to date has had to be postponed, but meanwhile we would appeal to all readers to redouble their efforts.

Forms will be found overleaf to fill in for either the Debt or the Guarantee Fund.

DEBT FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Previously acknowledged	277	8	4
H. Morgan, Bournemouth	0	3	0
Warren, Surrey	0	1	0
C. E. Turner	0	1	6
Hilda Shaw	0	5	0
Finsbury, E.C.	0	2	6
Proceeds of Sales per F.W.B.	0	1	10
W. Davidson	0	2	6
F. A. Hornibrook ..	0	14	0
Anonymous	0	10	0
J. T. Pound, London, S.W.	0	2	0
Carried forward	£279	11	8

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward	279	11	8
J.M., Hants.	0	13	0
D. R. Mortimer.. ..	0	10	0
Halfpenny Fund per N.	0	3	0
W. R. Cowlin	0	0	6
"Scot"	5	0	0
E. E. du Vergier ..	0	10	0
J. H. Hope	0	16	6
K. B. K., Kent	0	5	0
T.H.P., Surrey	0	13	0
	£288	2	8

GUARANTEE FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Previously acknowledged	18	0	2
Cell 19	0	3	0
	£18	3	2

In addition, contributions to the Guarantee Fund of 2s. from X.Y.Z. ; and £3 from "Iskra" have been received.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE
DAILY WORKER

for **essential** daily information on every phase of working class life and struggle.

Book reviews every Wednesday, Women's Page every Saturday, Co-op. Notes every Wednesday, TRADE UNION NOTES every Monday and **THE WORKER'S NOTE BOOK** and **"WHAT'S ON" every day.**

7d. per week post free from "Daily Worker," Nelson Place, Cayton Street, E.C.1

TO ADVERTISERS

THE DAILY WORKER has a steadily mounting circulation and is a valuable ADVERTISING MEDIUM. Write Advertisement Manager, *Daily Worker*, Nelson Place, Cayton St., E.C.1 for full terms and special quotations.

DEBT FUND

To the Manager, THE LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 John Street, London, W.C.1.

In response to your appeal I enclose herewith the sum of.....
as a contribution to the LABOUR MONTHLY *Debt Fund.*

Name.....

Address .....

.....

GUARANTEE FUND

To the Manager, THE LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 John Street, London, W.C.1.

I promise to send the sum of.....*monthly to the* LABOUR MONTHLY *Guarantee Fund until further notice and enclose herewith a first instalment of*.....

Name.....

Address .....

.....

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

The War Election—Defeat the National Government—War the Central Issue — The Government's War Policy — No "Death-bed Repentance" — The Government and Collective Peace—Barefaced Deception—Labour Opposition's Responsibility—Labour Pacifism's Disastrous Rôle—Britain, France and Germany—Fascist Central European Bloc—War Manœuvres —Rearmament—For What?—Italian-German Moves—Fascism in France — Mobilise the Fight — The Working Class Line in the Election—International Working Class Unity

ONE issue dominates all others in the coming election—the issue of war. The National Government is calling for a renewal of power for five years, and at the same time announces a heavy rearmament programme. These coming five years will be decisive for the question of the now closely menacing world war. The depth of the gathering war-crisis is still only incompletely understood. All eyes are fixed on the war of Italy on Abyssinia and the action, or mainly inaction, of the League. But in fact this Italian war on Abyssinia and the accompanying manœuvres within the League constitute only the prelude to the bigger gathering war issues. The semi-paralysis of the League is not merely a demonstration of the clumsy machinery of the League. It is above all a demonstration that the imperialist Powers of the League are primarily concerned, not with the question of Italy and Abyssinia, but with utilising this situation to manœuvre for position for the decisive future war issues. The central questions involved in these manœuvres are the questions of Nazi Germany, of the alignment of the Powers in Europe, of the relations of Britain and France, and, above all, of the relations of Britain and Nazi

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany. It is in these issues that the real war policy of the National Government lies concealed, at the same time as it endeavours to delude opinion by fixing attention on its rôle as supposed champion of the League against the Italian war on Abyssinia. If we fail to tear down this hypocrisy, if we fail to expose and make understood this real war-policy of the National Government, if we let this central fight on the field of foreign policy go by default (for in the present election these world issues, and not domestic issues, will inevitably be dominant), then we fail in our main task in this election, we leave the field free for the National Government to win an easy victory, we leave the course open to the advance to war. We must awaken the widest body of opinion to the seriousness of the war-menace that the National Government represents. The defeat of the National Government is of urgent importance in the present situation in British politics. It is of even more urgent importance in the present world situation.

LET there be no under-estimation of the seriousness of the fight that will be needed to defeat the National Government at the present stage. At the beginning of the year the National Government was at the height of its unpopularity. The rising mass revolt was forcing it into retreat. But that rising revolt was damped down by the line of the Labour Party leadership and its co-operation with the National Government in the national-chauvinist campaign of the Jubilee. To-day the situation is profoundly changed. The new world issues have driven the older issues temporarily into the background. The fatal blank cheque issued by the resolution of the Trades Union Congress and Labour Party Conference, which proclaimed unity behind the policy of action through the League to check Italian aggression (the professed policy of the National Government), and failed at the same time to criticise and expose the line of the National Govenment, has now been cashed by the National Government in calling the election. To-day the Labour Party leadership complains of the " partisan ramp " of the National Government in exploiting national unity for a party aim by calling the election at the present

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moment. The complaint is directed to the wrong address. Who gave them the weapon? Who gave them the possibility of raising the lying slogan of "national unity"?

AS the inevitable sequel of this line, signs have begun to appear of a tendency to run away from the central fight on foreign policy, to leave this as common ground, and endeavour to confine the conflict to "domestic issues." Thus the *Daily Herald* editorial of October 15 on "Election Issues" writes:

> The General Election will be fought on domestic issues, and not exclusively on foreign policy.
>
> Six months ago it looked as if foreign policy would dominate the election. Between Labour and Tories there was a gulf that seemed unbridgeable on foreign policy. Now, incredible as it would have seemed six months ago, the Government is supporting the League.
>
> The Government would like to fight entirely on foreign issues. But it is in for a disappointment and an awakening. The election will be fought on those issues about which Labour and Toryism are in fundamental disagreement.

This line is fatal. It implies that there is no "fundamental disagreement" on foreign policy, that an "unbridgeable gulf" may have "seemed" to exist "six month ago," but not now. This is to surrender the heart of the fight to the National Government. Most certainly we need to smash the National Government on its home record, on its spoliation of the masses in the interests of the big trusts, its reactionary offensive against popular rights and liberties, its protection of fascism. But we need no less urgently, and even above all, to smash the National Government on its foreign policy, its war policy, not only because this is the central ground on which it seeks to deceive the people, but because this is the most urgent issue of the whole situation to-day.

WHAT is the position? For four years, ever since the Japanese attack on Manchuria, which was only made possible because the British Government in practice protected it, throttled any question of League action on behalf of the Covenant and turned down the American pleas for co-operation against the Japanese aggression; and still more

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the past three years, since the advent of Hitler transformed the international situation, we have had occasion continuously to analyse month by month the menacing rôle of the National Government's foreign policy, its support of Hitler and Nazi rearmament, its support of fascism throughout the world and of the fascist revisionist war offensive, and its steady blocking of the collective peace policy represented by the Soviet Union, the smaller states and to a certain extent France. This is the centre of the present world situation and of the menace of world war. Between the collective peace grouping, represented by the Soviet Union, the smaller states, the Franco-Soviet Peace Pact and the similar Peace Pacts, on the one side, and the fascist war grouping, openly proclaiming its war aims, openly proclaiming the line of the "localisation of war" as against the collective peace line, on the other, the British National Government, holding the balancing position, has continuously used that balancing power on behalf of the fascist states, on behalf of rearmament, and against the collective peace line. There are divisions of currents in British policy ; strong currents see the dangers of the present line and preach support of the collective peace grouping against the fascist war aims ; but the dominant forces of British finance-capital, the most aggressive reactionary forces, the majority in the National Government, support the war line, the fascist line, the veiled alliance with Nazi Germany, the encouragement to German eastern expansionist aims, in order to weaken the French position in Europe, to build the bloc of Western Imperialism under British hegemony against the Soviet Union and eventually against the United States, and above all to further the basic anti-Soviet aims. This is the real world situation to which we need to awaken the consciousness of the electorate. The National Government is the chief enemy of collective peace and the decisive driving-force and accelerator, behind the scenes, of the menace of world war, of which Nazi Germany is the chief direct instigator.

TO-DAY at the moment of the election the lines appear crossed. The National Government opposes fascist Italy and proclaims devotion to the collective peace

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system. Does this mean a reversal of policy? On the contrary. We may hope that a point may yet be reached at which the menace of the world fascist war offensive may become so direct also to British imperialist interests as to compel, in conjunction with the mass pressure for peace, a change of line and alignment with the collective peace camp, with the Soviet Union and France. *But that change has not yet taken place.* The main line still goes forward, despite and alongside the Italian complication. The very manœuvres in the League over the question of Italy, the refusal of Britain to give to France any committal pledge of collective security in Europe, thereby ruining the prospects of even the desired collective action against the Italian war on Abyssinia, prove that the main line, the line of the veiled alliance with Nazi Germany, is still being actively pressed forward, even at the expense of the immediate interests of the Italian issue, which is thereby treated as secondary. There has thus been no sudden reversal of policy, no "deathbed repentance," as the Liberal-Labour illusionists love to declare. On the contrary, the new facts confirm in even more sinister form the old line.

THE Italian issue is in fact subordinate to the total world situation and can only be judged in relation to it. What has happened is that, contrary to British intentions and calculations, the first blow of the fascist expansion offensive, to which British policy has continually expressed its benevolence and sympathy, has in practice fallen in a region menacing British strategic interests. All the "cordial reassurances" of Italy to Britain on its benevolent intentions and promises of fullest consideration for the British interests involved cannot remove the hard strategic facts or conceal Italy's ultimate intentions in the Eastern Mediterranean. The conflict is there and cannot be removed by formulas; but it is a nuisance from the standpoint of the main British policy, and every attempt has therefore been made to smooth it over, to bribe Italy with tempting bargains and to delay a decisive issue. Italy has, however, with full realism, in exactly the same fashion as Japan, taken advantage of the conflict of the major imperialist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powers to go straight forward with its policy. Faced with this situation, the National Government has hastily called on the collective peace system, which it has up to this point consistently sabotaged, to rally to the defence of its interests. Then, utilising this temporary position for the purposes of internal politics, and knowing the unpopularity of its real foreign policy, the National Government proceeds to present itself on this basis to the electorate as the champion of peace, the League of Nations and collective defence against fascist aggression.

THE deception is barefaced. But this does not mean that the deception may not win a wide body of support, if the real total policy of the National Government is not exposed. For the position is a tricky one. The Italian fascist aggression is universally unpopular. The line of collective defence against aggression, espoused by the Soviet Union, is universally popular. It is further essential, and in the interests of the working class and of the struggle for peace, that effective collective measures should be taken, whatever the motives of the imperialist powers concerned, to check and defeat the Italian fascist aggression. It is true that the League machinery has singularly exposed itself by its incapacity to take any measures to prevent the long and openly prepared war, and by its extreme capacity to discover reasons for delaying any effective measures to check the war once begun. But the British Government is able to appear as demanding more active measures and to lay the blame for delay on the old enemy and villain of the piece, France. The fact that it is the total policy of the National Government which in reality made possible the Italian aggression and has made impossible and wrecked effective collective measures against it is not yet generally understood.

IT is here that the heavy responsibility arises of the line of the Labour Opposition, which has in practice assisted the National Government's deception on its foreign policy. It is true that there has been plenty of criticism in abstract principle of the Government's foreign policy, of its neglect of the League of Nations, of its record on disarmament. But all

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this remains in the air so long as it is not brought down to the real fight on the concrete issues of the world situation. On the abstract issues the spokesmen of the National Government can easily pay all the lip-service required and proclaim their devotion to the cause of the League of Nations, and their devotion to the cause of disarmament, if it were not for the difficulties caused by the other nations. The heart of the fight is not here. The heart of the fight lies in the National Government's diplomatic and material support of Hitler and of Nazi rearmament, and blocking of the Soviet Union peace policy. Here lies the real fight, the real sabotage of collective peace and preparation of future war. And just here the Labour Opposition surrendered the fight by supporting and applauding and even urging forward the National Government's support of Hitler and Nazi rearmament, in the name of ancient memories of "justice to Germany," thus helping to arm fascism and to prepare the future war. In the same way over the issue of Italy the official Labour propaganda played into the Government's hands by accepting at face value its own picture of its rôle, even to the extent of denying the obvious imperialist interests :

> There still seems to be a belief that the British attitude is determined only partly by the League. It is shaped also, it is said, by imperial interests. If France really believes this, she is making a great mistake. (*Daily Herald* editorial, August 29, 1935.)

This gratuitous denial of the glaringly obvious imperialist interests deceives no one. But it makes a present to the Government of the rôle of defender of the collective peace system, and thus assists the Government to win the election.

EVEN more disastrous has been the line of the Labour Pacifist minority, whether the direct pacifist wing or the wing which has presented essentially the same line of "Keep Out" with would-be "socialist" arguments. This line attacks the Government, not for its reactionary foreign policy of the support of Hitler (which Lansbury repeatedly praised) and opposition to the Soviet Union peace policy, but for its readiness to take measures in the name of the collective

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace system against the Italian fascist aggression. What is the effect of this propaganda? The effect of this propaganda is to confirm and strengthen the position of the Government in the eyes of the majority of the population, who are equally opposed to war and to abstract pacifism, and who are prepared to support the line of collective resistance to aggression as the line of the fight for peace. This propaganda is a free gift to the Government, chiming in with the Government's own propaganda, and driving this main body of opinion, constituting the majority of the nation, into the Government's camp. But it is precisely here where the fight needs to be fought. It is precisely this main body of opinion, profoundly anti-war and anti-fascist in sentiment, whose real outlook is not at all expressed by the policy of the National Government, whom we need above all to seek to win, not on the basis of denouncing their ideal of collective peace—if collective peace could be realised, it would be in the interests of the working class and of socialism —but on the basis of the fullest understanding of the ideals and aims they have at heart, and on this basis exposing the real rôle of the National Government as the chief enemy of collective peace and of all their aims.

WHAT have the manœuvres of the imperialist powers over the question of the Italian war revealed? They have brought the whole European situation into the forefront, far beyond the immediate Italian-Abyssinian issue. The paralysis of the League machinery has been revealed as the reflection of the British-French antagonism. The British-French antagonism in its turn has been revealed as turning on the pivotal question of Hitler-Germany and British relations to Hitler-Germany. France, before being ready to forego its Italian alliance, which is itself a reflection of the issue of Hitler-Germany in connection with Austria, demanded an explicit pledge from Britain that it would stand by the Covenant and the collective peace system equally in the case of any issue of aggression in Europe. The significance of this question is clear. For in respect of the West, Britain has already given its pledge of Locarno, and has no intention of allowing war in this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

direction. The question turns on Eastern and Central Europe and the openly expressed fascist expansion aims. To this question the British reply refused to recognise any binding commitment (" elasticity is a part of security . . . the world is not static . . . there may be degrees of aggression . . . the nature of the action appropriate to be taken may vary according to the circumstances of each particular case"). This reply, in its actual effect repudiating the collective peace system and supporting the fascist expansion aims, inevitably wrecked the possibility of French co-operation in checking the Italian war on Abyssinia. But what does this mean? *It means that the National Government puts its major aims of the alliance with Hitler and support of the fascist expansion aims in Eastern Europe in front of even its immediate interests in the temporary quarrel with Italy.* The major pro-fascist and anti-peace policy of the National Government is defeating even its attempt to exploit the collective peace system against the Italian war on Abyssinia; and in this way the final responsibility for the failure to prevent or stop the Italian war on Abyssinia, which may in consequence develop to the menace of new and dangerous extensions, falls directly on the policy of the National Government. But it means above all that the future menace of war through the policy of the National Government is far wider than the question of Italy and Africa; and it is this real menace of the National Government's foreign policy, which is kept concealed from the electorate, to which we need to awaken realisation.

PARALLEL to this, and no less important, are the moves of the German and Central European fascist camp at the same time as the Italian onslaught on Abyssinia. Germany's final departure from the League of Nations has now taken effect since October 21. The fascist states of Austria and Hungary, while formally in the League, disassociate themselves from it and support fascist Italy. At the end of September took place the Rominter meeting in East Prussia of Germany, represented by Goering and von Ribbentrop; Hungary, represented by the Prime Minister, Goemboes; Poland, represented

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by General Fabrici and Prince Radziwill, the Chairman of the Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee ; and Finland, represented by General Mannerheim. The aim was set, according to the *Times* Berlin correspondent, to reach

> a future German - Polish - Hungarian - Italian - Bulgarian—even possibly Rumanian—bloc. . . .
>
> It seems to be feared in some conservative circles not only that air arrangements have been discussed, but also that naval and military ideas have been exchanged ; and that Bulgaria, Finland (whose strategical position for naval operations is talked of), and even Rumania—since the Soviet-Rumanian rapprochement began to look like a false alarm—have been drawn in. Even Japan is suspected of figuring in these dreams of the future. (*Times*, October 15, 1935.)

The German-Polish-Hungarian alliance, drawing in Finland and Bulgaria, and in combination with Japan, goes forward. Against what enemy ? It does not need any profound insight or observation of the map to judge.

AT Geneva Litvinov's criticism in principle of the theories of the " localisation of war " in opposition to the collective peace system, and of the proposed alternative to the collective principle in the shape of so-called " non-aggression pacts " between two countries, with no clause to cancel their validity in the case of aggression by one of the two countries against a third, drew immediately the fire of Colonel Beck, the Polish Foreign Minister. Why ? Because this criticism, although no direct reference was made to Poland or Germany, exposed the essentially aggressive character of the German-Polish Treaty, in contrast to the Peace Pacts of the Franco-Soviet type, based solely on collective defence within a collective system, and open to Germany or to any other state to join. Meanwhile von Ribbentrop, Hitler's emissary, passes from capital to capital in Central Europe and the Balkans, drawing together the threads of the war plan, to London, to Brussels : to the Belgian Prime Minister, Van Zeeland, in a secret interview he offers, according to the press reports :

> If Belgium would guarantee not to take any action against Germany if Germany became involved in any struggle in Eastern Europe, Belgium need fear nothing from rearmed Germany.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Negotiations with the Scandinavian countries are pressed forward. Denmark gave the sole vote for Germany in the Geneva meeting on the Military Law. The Swedish paper, *Aftonbladet*, reports :

> Without having any antagonism to the great French nation, Sweden is gliding over more and more to the German-Polish-British side.

" The German-Polish-British side " : there is no question of the actual alignment as seen by the sharp eyes of the smaller countries, which find themselves subjected to heavier and heavier pressure to be drawn into the British-German war bloc, even at the same time as all their sentimental sympathies are on the side of collective peace.

THE dangerous war manœuvres of the fascist offensive go forward more and more rapidly in Europe under the direct leadership of Nazi Germany with its concentration of all organisation on war and openly proclaimed war aims. And it is to these plans of the fascist offensive and fascist rearmament that the British National Government has so far given its patronage and protection, and for sake of these wrecked the line of collective peace : " elasticity . . . there may be degrees of aggression . . . the world is not static." It is for the sake of this policy that the National Government requires its gigantic rearmament plan. If the line of collective peace were followed, no such rearmament plan would be required ; if a Peace Pact between Britain and the Soviet Union were signed parallel to the Franco-Soviet Peace Pact and that of the Soviet Union and Czecho-Slovakia, together with acceptance of the inescapable Soviet definition of the aggressor, then on the basis of Britain, France and the Soviet Union, with the support of all the smaller states, and with the door open to Germany and the other states of Central Europe, collective peace could be maintained without the need of such rearmament. In fact the network of imperialist contradictions, with the decisive rôle represented by the British National Government, is barring the way. The National Government appears before the electorate in the name of collective peace to secure a mandate for its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rearmament plan. It will use that rearmament, if it gets it, for a very different purpose.

IT is worth noting, further, that there are strong signs of a closer approach between Italy and Germany. In the first week of September, immediately after the League of Nations Council decisions, a cordial exchange took place between the new Italian Ambassador to Berlin and Hitler, who spoke of "the community of many ideals which binds Fascist Italy and National Socialist Germany." By the beginning of October, after the League decision of Italian aggression, the Italian press was holding out the possibility of Italy joining the German Central European bloc. Thus the *Giornale d'Italia* wrote :

> Italy could become part of such an alliance, especially if Britain, with her threatening attitude, and France, with her enforced passivity, were to compel her. . . . Such an alliance might possibly lead to a transformation of the map of Europe.

The consequences of this are worth noting. It was the Anglo-German Naval Agreement, disrupting the Stresa front, which opened the way for the Italian independent advance on the East African adventure. The consequent threatening British attitude against Italy next drives Italy towards joining the German front. But Britain is already engaged, as we have seen, in backing and assisting the German bloc, even to the extent of putting this major aim in front of the immediate interests of the quarrel with Italy. What follows ? We may yet see Britain and Italy seeking to reach a composition of their African difference on the basis of coming together on the major issues of the fascist revisionist front. If that happens, the outlook will be fully dangerous.

NOR is that all. The fascist offensive is now concentrating all its forces to strike its decisive blow in France. The complicity of Laval and the fascist leagues has been proved by events. The declarations of De La Rocque, of Jean Renaud, of Dorgères, of all the fascist leaders are open calls to civil war for the overthrow of parliament and seizure of power. De La Rocque visits Laval to declare that if sanctions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are enforced by France it will mean civil war. The lists of the names of the anti-fascist leaders are published in the fascist press with direct incitements to murder (" You have somewhere an automatic, a revolver or even a knife. This weapon, whatever it may be, will serve for use against the enemies of peace, of whom you have the list. Propagate that. Propagate that."—*Action Francaise*, October 14, 1935.) The Laval Government no more interferes with this than with the open illegal arming of the fascist leagues. This approaching decisive struggle of fascism and anti-fascism in France is directly bound up with the international situation. The fascist bands parade the streets shouting " Down with sanctions ! " and threatening civil war if sanctions are attempted. The united trade unions answer with the call for collective action against the Italian fascist aggression. Here there is no possibility of the blind confusion of the blinkered, insular conditions in Britain, where so-called socialists can still fail to see that this fight of the international situation is in very truth a front of the class war. The foreign policy of French fascism is open and unconcealed for the support of Mussolini and the for support of Hitler. If fascism conquers in France, it will carry through the alliance with Hitler. This is the calculation of Hitler and of the reactionary forces of the National Government. If fascism conquers in France, and if the National Government receives a renewal of power in England, we may see the most rapid transformation of the international situation to the united counter-revolutionary front of Western Imperialism for war on the working class, for war on socialism, and for war on the Soviet Union.

THESE are the menacing realities of the present situation. Against this menace we need to mobilise the supreme concentration of all forces. The People's Front in France has mobilised the majority of the population, the united working class, with the steel core of the Communist Party, now eighty thousand strong, drawing in its wake the majority of the petty bourgeoisie, and fights now in the decisive centre of the struggle of fascism and anti-fascism at the present point to meet and drive back the shock of the fascist attack. The Abyssinian

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masses are fighting with their lives to drive back the fascist assault. The Soviet Union, stronger than ever before, is placing all its power in the scales in the international situation and through the League machinery, meeting the imperialists on their own ground and exercising an increasing influence on the smaller states, for the line of collective peace and resolute resistance to the fascist offensive.

AND in Britain? In Britain we have not the least responsible task of the whole fight. Our task in Britain is to defeat the National Government. This is the supreme need, not only for the British situation, but for the world situation. The defeat of the National Government will transform the international situation and mean a setback to the forces of fascism on a world scale. In order to defeat the National Government we need to mobilise and unite all forces, to unite all the forces of the working class and all the elements of the population opposed to fascism and war. In order to realise this unity, which can alone defeat the National Government, we need to unite on the basis of the elementary struggle against fascism and war, against the reactionary offensive, and for the immediate demands of the masses, and on this basis to return a Labour Government in order to carry forward the fight for our demands. We do not withdraw our criticisms of the reformist programme of the Labour Party; we warn against reformist illusions in a Labour Government as the instrument of the working class struggle for socialism. The revolutionary struggle will have to be faced in Britain; the issue of fascism only makes this the more certain. But for this very reason the supreme need to-day is the uniting of the broadest mass front against the urgent menace of war and the fascist offensive, against the menace represented by the National Government and its policy. The united mass front needs to be built in the election, to defeat the National Government, to return a Labour Government on the basis of the demands of the united struggle, and to carry forward this united struggle in the critical situation before us.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MORE than that. Our special responsibility in Britain at the present point is not only to fight with every means in our power to defeat the National Government as of decisive importance for the present stage of the world situation, as well as of the struggle in Britain. We have a further special international responsibility at the present point. The meeting of the Executive of the Labour and Socialist International in Brussels in October has rejected the approach of the Communist International for negotiations for a united front. This is a very serious fact in the present world situation. But the conditions of this decision make it even more serious. Last November the rejection was carried by a majority against a considerable minority for the united front. To-day the majority is for the united front. Only a minority of five parties blocked the way. The official statement declares that the Executive " is obliged to take into account the views " of these five parties (Britain, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Czecho-Slovakia), and " therefore is unable to accept the invitation of the Communist International." The majority has to give way to the minority. Why? Because the minority threatened otherwise to split the organisation. The principles of democracy and majority rule are flung to the winds as soon as the decision does not go in their favour. The leader of this minority disruptive group, which alone now stands in the way of world working class unity in the struggle, is the British Labour Party. This is the fact of concern to the working class movement in Britain, whose desire for unity and solidarity is certainly not represented by this stand. We must fight to see that this line is changed. This is an elementary responsibility to the international working class. We cannot allow that the British working class movement shall be made the obstacle to world working class unity. The fight for unity needs to go forward alike in the elections, in the new developing struggles in Britain, in the international working class movement, and in the whole present world situation against the close and increasing menace of war and the fascist offensive.

R. P. D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOCIALISTS, THE WAR AND THE GENERAL ELECTION

By J. R. CAMPBELL

THE present war crisis has tested the whole Labour Movement. It has shown in the clearest possible light the ability of the various sections of the Labour Movement to analyse a war situation and to give concrete guidance to the workers as to how to struggle in the defence of peace. It has exposed those who are ready at the slightest pretext to line up with their own capitalist governments in any and every war, and also those who substitute revolutionary phrases for revolutionary action, and lifeless formulæ for the concrete analysis of a complex situation.

The Origin of the Present War Crisis

It must never be forgotten that the present war situation arises out of the capitalist crisis and of the fierce economic warfare waged by the capitalists of each country in an effort to escape from the crisis. The tariff wars, the currency wars, the subsidising of exports and the increase of dumping generally have created economic chaos throughout the world. And it must be noted that amongst those who have been foremost in the waging of this aggressive economic warfare have been the " democratic " capitalist States like Britain, France, and the U.S.A. Precisely because those countries possessed a considerable empire and wide-flung spheres of influence outside of their Empire proper, they were able not only to squeeze their own workers, but the millions in the colonies, and also the capitalist class in other countries which were trading with those colonies. The greatest successes in the economic warfare were obtained by those capitalist countries, which like Britain, had a large Empire at their disposal.

Although in theory (as distinct from practice) Fascist theorists have talked much about autarchy, national self-sufficiency, economic nationalism, the fact remains that the practice of economic warfare by all the leading capitalist countries has hit the Fascist States most of all, because they had not a large empire at their disposal as a market or a source of investment. Capitalist states like Germany and Italy, in spite of the aggressiveness of their economic policy, in spite of the low wages which Fascism has imposed on the workers got decidedly the worst of the struggle.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Note that this is a fact of monopoly capitalism and not of nature. It is not because Italy is " over populated " or that the Germans are " people without room " that their present situation arises. These peoples are being hemmed in not by their frontiers, but by the system of monopoly capitalism. Remove the shackles of that system and the peoples of Italy and Germany could immediately obtain a higher standard of life.

The position in Italy and Germany has undoubtedly been aggravated by the economic contortions of the Fascist Governments in their effort to escape from the crisis and particularly by the terrific cost of the re-armaments programme. The more the situation worsens, the more the Fascist governments seek to save the system of monopoly capitalism and to uphold the dictatorship by telling their peoples that not the capitalist system but the existing division of colonial territories is at fault, and that there is no tolerable future for the people unless a new share out of the territory of the world can be procured by war.

In pursuit of this policy, Nazi Germany becomes the leader of a group of European Fascist States intent on an early war. It builds an anti-Soviet alliance with Poland and Hungary and seeks to bring Bulgaria into this alliance. This Fascist coalition is primarily directed against the Soviet Union, but it also menaces the independence of a whole number of the smaller European states such as Czechoslovakia, Austria, Lithuania, Latvia, and Esthonia, and is a direct menace also to French imperialist interests.

It is essential in considering the present situation in Abyssinia not to lose sight for a single moment of this coalition of European Fascism (linked up with Japanese imperialism), the main objective of which is a war on the Soviet Union.

It is clear that this war situation, like the war in Abyssinia, is a product of the development of capitalist antagonisms. This has led some people to the conclusion that since war is inevitable under the capitalist system it is impossible for the workers to engage in any effective struggle for the preservation of peace. But the fact that war is inevitable under the capitalist system does not mean that any particular war situation need necessarily lead to war or that any small war once it breaks out cannot be brought to a speedy conclusion instead of being allowed to spread. Whether a war situation leads to an actual outbreak of war depends on struggle—on the struggle of the forces of peace against the forces of war.

Here the elementary fact must be noted that not all capitalist states desire an immediate outbreak of war. The small states which stand to lose their independence in the event of war are desperately anxious to hold off an outbreak of war as are certain imperialist countries like France. Nevertheless, the strength of those countries is not sufficient to have held off the outbreak of a war unless they are reinforced by the Soviet Union.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The entry of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations, and the conclusion of a series of non-aggression pacts has placed tremendous barriers in the way of the warmongers.

The Character of the League of Nations To-day

When certain I.L.P'ers quote with glee the Communist definition of the League of Nations as a " thieves' kitchen " they are deliberately ignoring this relation of forces. They forget that the description " thieves' kitchen " was part of a concrete analysis of the rôle that the League was playing at a given moment, and that this re-quotation cannot absolve Socialists from enquiring what rôle the League is playing in the present situation.

Two things must be noted. The most dangerous thieves have left the kitchen or are on the point of leaving it. Japan and Germany are outside, Italy is on the threshold. Evidently the kitchen is some kind of restraint on those countries who want an immediate war. And again, not all in the kitchen are thieves. The Soviet Union and the small states are interested in the preservation of peace.

This surely gives us the opportunity of mobilising a powerful peace movement in every capitalist country, to bring pressure to bear on the government of the day to support the peace forces of the League, while at the same time preparing the ground for the defeat of governments whose policy is notoriously anti-League.

This peace movement has not only a duty in relation to its own government, it has the duty of concentrating the forces of the working class and of all peace lovers on an international scale against those governments which at any given moment are the chief instigators of war.

Within this movement the revolutionaries must work for the winning of the pacifist masses for the full revolutionary line against war. We can give no blank cheques to the League of Nations. We can cherish no illusions regarding it. Our analysis of it must be a Marxist, and not a Liberal, analysis. The League of Nations is not " the nucleus of a world order " ; it is not a body which can abolish war within capitalist society. When the Soviet Union entered the League of Nations, Comrade Litvinov said :

> Far be it from me to overrate the opportunities and means of the League of Nations for the organisation of peace. I realise perhaps better than any of you how limited these means are. I am aware that the League does not possess the means for the complete abolition of war. I am, however, convinced that, with the firm will and close co-operation of all its members, a great deal could be done at any given moment for the utmost diminution of the danger of war, and this is a sufficiently honourable and lofty task, the fulfilment of which would be of incalculable advantage to humanity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We must not forget these words to-day. When in the *New Statesman* pamphlet on Abyssinia it is asserted " It is nearer the truth to regard it as a League of Socialist and Democratic States bonded together against the menace of Fascism," that is an unwarranted idealisation of the League. The Labour Governments of Scandinavia are not socialist but left capitalist governments, and all of the small states in the League are not democratic even in the capitalist sense of the word. No, we have got to take the League just as it is " without one plea." It is composed *in the main* of capitalist states which do not want an immediate war plus the Soviet Union. It can on this basis be made a barrier against the most rapacious warmongers. A realistic Socialist appraisal of the League does not in any way diminish its usefulness at this stage.

It is in the light of this background that we must see the war in Abyssinia.

Away back in May, 1934, Karl Radek wrote an article entitled " The Dialectic of History and the League of Nations," in which he analysed the forces remaining in the League. He divided them as follows: (1) The small States seeking to avoid a new world cataclysm ; (2) France which has everything to lose by war, and (3) Great Britain and Italy which are preparing to take part in a new struggle for the division of the world, but think (Great Britain) that the time has not come to come out openly on the side of the powers preparing for a new world war, or (like Italy) seek for what they can get by playing on the differences between the leading imperialist powers. This analysis has been strikingly confirmed.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that Italy embarked on the Abyssinian war thinking that she was so indispensable to Britain and France that she would encounter no opposition to this project. It seems tolerably clear now that Laval in January agreed to support Italy in this adventure, and when no British objection was raised during the Stresa conference in April (after Abyssinia had appealed to the League) it was only natural that Mussolini should give the signal of " full steam ahead."

The I.L.P. and the League

Now how did the Socialist Press estimate the effect of Mussolini's adventure on world peace. Here is the *New Leader* before it lost its head :

> The campaign in Ethiopia cannot be localised. Its consequences will spread to Europe. Diplomacy is seeking favourable footholds. The voice of the working class has yet to be heard. (*New Leader*, July 5.)
>
> The realists led by Mr. Garvin plead that he (Mussolini) be given his head so as not to jeopardise the integrity of Austria, the cornerstone of peace in Europe.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> This is the most short-sighted of all policies. By a formal peace Mussolini will gain the fruits of war. What if Germany—rearmed by Britain—next threatens to annex Austria. Again in order to maintain "the indivisibility of peace," peace will be maintained and another Fascist power strengthened.
>
> In a way Abyssinia to-day is the testing centre of European civilisation. Either it will receive another blow or the common people of all countries will at last see that the Governments and the League will do nothing to stop the war and that it is on themselves that the onus will rest to prepare and organise immediately to hamper and obstruct all war preparations against Abyssinia. (*New Leader*, July 19.)
>
> The Abyssinian conflict cannot be "localised," the sufferers will be the workers of all countries. (*New Leader*, July 26.)
>
> The system (the collective peace system) is founded on the idea that all nations should take common action against an aggressor with the League of Nations as the pivot of action.
>
> There is no doubt that Italy is the aggressor in the war it is preparing against Abyssinia. Both Italy and Abyssinia are members of the League of Nations. It is the obligation of all members of the League of Nations to take common action against Italy. But it is clear that they will not do so. (*New Leader*, July 19.)

So up until the middle of July the I.L.P. saw the war danger as follows. The League would not restrain Mussolini from attacking Abyssinia. This would be a stimulus to Hitler. Unless the workers stopped Mussolini there would be danger for everyone in Europe because the war could not be localised.

No fear was expressed at this time as to the danger of League action against Italy. No, the I.L.P. saw the League paralysed and unable to act and Mussolini getting away with it.

The Left Socialist Parties associated with the I.L.P. shared this analysis. They did not see the League as fiercely aggressive and likely to plunge the world into war.

"The world," said an appeal of the Left Parties, "is now facing a case of open imperialism in the piracy of Fascist Italy against Abyssinia. The collective system of peace could not have a better chance to vindicate its principles and promises." (*New Leader*, August 16.) In short the Left Parties' statement invited the League to wake up and do something about it. But a few weeks later when the League started moving with the rapidity of a South American sloth the I.L.P. takes fright, throws overboard its previous analysis, and sees the real war danger in a League of Nations war against Signor Mussolini.

> The opposition of the workers to a war led by the National Government has unfortunately been weakened by the attitude of the Labour Party, the T.U.C. and even the Communist Party. They are all advocating support for sanctions by the League of Nations, despite the capitalist character of the governments, which dominate the League and would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conduct the war. It is important that all sections of the working class which are opposed to this policy should immediately get together and unitedly demonstrate their determination to resist an imperialist led war. (*New Leader*, September 6.)

We are compelled to express our deep horror and regret at the attitude of the Labour Party Executive and the Trades Union Congress in urging the Government to wage war on Italy in the name of collective security through the League of Nations.

The difference between the two rival dictators and the interests behind them are not worth a single British life. (*New Leader*, September 13.)

What caused this amazing change over ? In the first place the realisation of the British imperialist conflict with Italy, and secondly, the cumulative effect of Fascist war propaganda on wavering Socialist elements.

The British imperialists were slow in realising the implications of Mussolini's war adventure, but when they realised the danger to their imperial communications, no less than their immediate interests in Egypt, they acted quickly. There can be no doubt that the attitude of British imperialism in the League of Nations has nothing to do with concern for the League as an institution or for the independence of Abyssinia.

Indeed it is impossible to deny that no body of people in the world has less right to adopt a moral pose about " aggressors " and " sanctity of covenants " than the National Government of Great Britain.

It was the leading party in this Government—the Conservative Party—that was in office in 1925 when the British and Italian Governments attempted to divide up Abyssinia into spheres of influence and infringe on its sovereignty. It was this party which has deliberately kept Egypt —a country on a much higher level of development than Abyssinia—out of the League of Nations. It was British imperialism that not once but on scores of occasions behaved in Africa in the manner that Mussolini is now seeking to emulate in Abyssinia.

What is the Workers' Case Against Mussolini's Attack ?

But if the British Government has no case against Mussolini, that does not mean that the international working class has no case or that it must cease to obstruct Signor Mussolini's war plans because British imperialism for its own purposes is intent on obstructing him. The I.L.P. and the Socialist League refuse to see this and present the following simplified analysis :

The dispute has become a clash between sated and unsated imperialism over the disposal of an exploitable territory in possession of a " backward race." (Socialist League Statement to Branches, September 22.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this simplified analysis the following " trifles " are forgotten :

(1) The struggle of the Abyssinian people.

(2) The capitalist states in the League who want to uphold its prestige and power as a barrier against the war makers.

(3) The Soviet Union and its determined peace policy.

Neither the I.L.P. nor the Socialist League saw these forces.

The I.L.P. would have it that the Soviet Union was prepared to sacrifice Abyssinia because of its non-aggression pact with France (which the I.L.P. regards as an old style alliance) and its friendship with Italy.

> There is one government in the League which is not capitalist. Socialists are hoping Soviet Russia will speak out. Soviet Russia has the right to do so because Russia is not imperialist. Socialists are hoping that M. Litvinoff (who will preside at the Council meeting) will not allow himself to be silenced because of the Soviet-French alliance, the Soviet-French diplomatic friendship. (*New Leader*, July 26, 1935.)

When Litvinov did speak out in an unmistakable manner the *New Leader* refrained from giving his speech a reasonable amount of publicity.

The Socialist League is even nastier.

> The Socialist League must not flinch from declaring that the immediate needs of the Soviet Union, vis-a-vis France and Germany, do not constitute valid grounds for mobilising the workers of this country in support of the " sanctions " policy of the National Government or of the League of Nations. (Socialist League Statement, September 22.)

Here the Soviet Peace Policy is reduced to " the immediate needs of the Soviet Union, vis-a-vis France and Germany." And this at a time when France is opposing sanctions and the Soviet Union in spite of the cheap I.L.P. sneers at the " French Alliance" is supporting strong League action against the aggressor. The great Peace policy that is defending the lives of the workers of all lands is presented by the Socialist League as a cheap and nasty diplomatic bargain.

Given the fact that there were other forces in the League besides British imperialism, and that those forces were fighting for peace, what should be the attitude of the working class ?

The reply of the Communist Party was unequivocal. It was that the workers must do all in their power to strengthen those peace forces by exerting the utmost pressure on their own governments which were either opposing sanctions (France) or threatening them as a means to forcing an imperialist bargain (Britain).

In the early days of the conflict over Abyssinia the I.L.P. saw nothing wrong in a government embargo on goods going to Italy.

> If the British Government will not place an embargo upon war materials to Italy, the organised workers should take the matter into their own hands. (*New Leader*, July 19.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Do the Socialists Say?

But immediately there arose the possibility of the workers by their pressure, by resorting to all forms of direct action, forcing a majority of the League governments to take much more drastic economic action against Italy than the mere imposition of an embargo on war materials, the I.L.P. proceeded to act as if all the peace forces in the League were the dupes of the National Government and that all collective action against Mussolini was action in favour of the British Government.

Here was a deliberate refusal to mobilise the workers to back up the peace forces of the League at the same time resolutely exposing and opposing the policy of the National Government.

When the real war danger remained unchanged the danger that Mussolini " would get away with it," the danger that (unless the workers developed their own independent action) the League would be faltering and ineffective, the I.L.P. and the Socialist League depicted the League as being a body which was plotting a war against Italy.

" War faces the British workers," shouted the *New Leader*. " Sanctions mean War." " The proof about the imperialist plot at Geneva."

All this was simply wavering before the Fascist war propaganda. For when Mussolini decided to attack Abyssinia he had to neutralise the strong anti-Fascist forces in Britain and France. His main line was " Sanctions mean War," *i.e.*, that any attempt to interfere with his robber war would only spread the war. Yet at the height of the most critical moment of the struggle to force the League to put barriers in the way of Mussolini, the I.L.P. and the Socialist League relays this propaganda.

> The threatened war is not for the defence of Abyssinia against Italy. It is for the defence of British and French imperialist interests against Italian imperialist interests. (I.L.P. Appeal to the Working Class, September 27.)

Fundamentally this attitude amounts to an attempt to wage war on the international fight for peace. It is a refusal to recognise that the weight of the working class must be thrown not only against its own government, but also internationally against the Fascist aggressor states. An unreal war danger is set up to prevent the workers fighting against the real war danger.

The limit is reached in the issue of the *New Leader* on Friday, October 18, printed at a time when it is already clear that owing to the divergent interests of the imperialist powers in the League there will be the utmost difficulty in getting the League of Nations to agree to effective economic sanctions.

Yet the I.L.P. professes to see a danger that the League which is hesitating even on economic sanctions, will promptly proceed at the behest of the National Government to impose military sanctions which will lead to war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the beginning of the Abyssinian war the I.L.P. called for " workers' sanctions " against Italy. Now in the Manifesto of October 18 all question of action against Italy is dropped. Committees of Action are called for. But their object is not to stop supplies going to Italy, but to fight against sanctions. This policy at that moment meant a fight: (1) against the decision to impose an arms embargo on Italy ; (2) against a decision to impose a financial embargo ; (3) against a decision to impose a war materials embargo, and (4) against a proposal for an embargo on Italian exports. The last time Councils of Action functioned in Britain they were for an embargo on the warmaker. The I.L.P. proposes that they shall fight against a League embargo on the warmaker. Such are the fruits of topsy-turvy pacifism masquerading as a revolutionary policy against war.

The Socialist League also glories in its shame :

> The Socialist League must not be disturbed by being accused by official Labour or by the Communists of " taking a negative line." There is nothing negative in standing for a policy which exposes the real causes of war, of winning support for that policy, and of waging battle with the forces of capitalism at home by exposing its real purposes and aims and by seeking to mobilise the workers in the fight for power. (Statement to Branches, September 22.)

So in a war situation the Socialist League sees it to be the sole duty of the Socialists to explain that wars are due to capitalism, and that our own Government is imperialist. That is a miserable negation of Internationalism.

But the attitude of both those parties to an attack not on Abyssinia but on the Soviet Union—the Fatherland of the workers—is one which every British worker must note.

We have already quoted the remarks of the Socialist League concerning the Soviet Union. Here is what the " Left " Parties, with which the I.L.P. is associated, are saying :

> The Communist International is also urging national unity with the ruling class in capitalist countries, allied to the U.S.S.R., and encourages reliance upon the League of Nations and a collective system of peace within capitalism. The International Bureau calls on the workers to resist every appeal for national unity with the capitalist class or capitalist governments, and to prepare for mass revolutionary action against war. (*New Leader*, August 16.)

The line of the I.L.P. and the Socialist League is perfectly clear. Suppose the Fascist coalition now being formed in Europe decides to attack the Soviet Union. A state of war tension exists. A number of capitalist states in the League have signed mutual assistance pacts with the Soviet Union. A number of other League countries are in their own interests in favour of restraining the Fascist bloc. The question of whether the mutual assistance pacts will hold, or the other League Powers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will act will be a determining factor in whether the Fascist bloc will lead a war against the Soviet Union at a given moment.

The position of the I.L.P. and the Socialist League in this situation is as follows. They will advocate that the Socialists in the countries having a mutual assistance pact with the Soviet Union should demand that their governments tear up the pact and leave the Soviet Government in the lurch. They will demand in Britain " no economic sanctions" against the Fascist bloc (*i.e.*, no embargo on arms for the Fascists, no embargo on loans, full freedom for British capitalism to supply the Fascist states with food and raw materials), and, of course, no military sanctions. And this lining up with Fascism is called a revolutionary Socialist policy.

Note that support of the pact, support of sanctions does not mean support of the existing capitalist government in any country. It will mean a resolute fight against such governments in favour of their replacement by governments really supporting the energetic carrying through of the pacts and the Covenant of the League.

It is quite clear that the I.L.P. and the Socialist League, by deserting the immediate fight for peace in connection with Abyssinia, are preparing for a still bigger desertion—the desertion of the defence of the Soviet Union.

To Stop the War—Defeat the Government

Those parties in their effort to confuse the working class have undoubtedly been aided by the Labour Party and T.U.C.

Right from the start the Labour Party and the T.U.C. treated the National Government's action in calling for League action against Mussolini as a " death-bed repentance "—*i.e.*, a belated but genuine adherence to the principles of collective security.

That the National Government was pursuing imperialist aims through the League they refused to recognise.

At the Trades Union Congress Citrine said :

> The National Government can be abused and is abused every day in the week by individual delegates, but we do not propose to bring forward to you in every one of our resolutions we submit some new expletive, some new opprobrium of the latest misdeed of the capitalist government of this country or any other country.
>
> As for Mr. Rowlands, he said in his well meditated speech that what we have to do is to expose the war policy of our own government. He failed to give any evidence of that policy in respect to Abyssinia.

This was said after the newspapers had been full of details : (1) regarding the attempt of Eden to fix up an imperialist bargain with Signor Mussolini at Rome, and (2) the efforts of the same gentleman to conclude a deal with Baron Aloisi at Paris.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For weeks before Citrine spoke there were on sale pamphlets on Abyssinia describing the secret treaties between the imperialists of Britain, France and Italy in respect to that country.

The black record of the National Government in respect to disarmament, in respect to the collective system, needed to be emphasised more than ever (in a situation when the Labour Movement was supporting sanctions), in order to show that real support of the collective peace system meant an energetic drive for the early defeat of the National Government.

Not only did the refusal to do this at the T.U.C. confuse the movement, but it has left it in a measure unprepared to meet the electoral onslaught of the National Government.

First and foremost in our fight to defeat this Government and replace it by a Labour Government must come a root and branch exposure of the policy of the National Government—the most warlike government in the world outside the open Fascist powers.

It was the protector of rapacious Japanese imperialism in its attack on China. It is the supporter of rearming German Fascism. The consequences of its signing the Naval Treaty with Germany are seen in the split between French and British imperialism in the League to-day, and all the consequent paralysis.

Now this Government is coming out for a rearmament programme—a programme for enriching the private arms trusts in this country.

It is coming out with the proposition for a *defence loan* so that the rich can avoid paying for the defence of their empire and can enrich themselves not only as armament shareholders, but also as subscribers to the defence loan.

We must see in this Government not the defender of the League, but its enemy. Not the enemy of the main Fascist powers, but their supporter. For that reason all who wish to fight Fascism and War must level the barriers and unite the forces of the working class and of all friends of peace for the complete destruction of this Government.

MARX MEMORIAL LIBRARY AND WORKERS' SCHOOL

WINTER SESSION NOW OPEN

TEN SEPARATE COURSES OF DAY AND EVENING CLASSES on Trade Unionism, Political Economy, British Working Class Politics, Dialectical Materialism, etc. etc.

Lecturers include: **JOHN STRACHEY, R. PAGE ARNOT, JOHN MAHON**

SPECIAL DAY CLASS on MONDAYS for SHIFT WORKERS and others on THE BASIS OF SOCIALISM. *Lecturer*: **T. A. JACKSON.** *POPULAR LECTURES every Sunday evening (free to members)*

Write or Call for Prospectus:

MARX HOUSE, CLERKENWELL GREEN, E.C.1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

By HARRY POLLITT[1]

WHAT is the next perspective that the Congress puts forward? It puts forward the perspective of the unity of the Labour Movement. You have a right to ask me to define this more precisely, and I will.

The split in the Labour movement was caused in 1914 by the policy of Social Democracy in the imperialist war. We now put consciously to the working class the perspective that the menace of fascism and war should be the driving force that leads to the healing of that split. We fight for a single Trade Union centre in every country and for one Trade Union International. One united revolutionary working-class party in every country and one international of the working class. We make certain proposals and certain stipulations in regard to the achieving of these, but we say here that the prerequisite to any advance towards their final achievement depends on *unity in action now*, that our Party must come out absolutely openly and boldly in this country as the champions for the unification of the Labour movement.

George Lansbury spoke at the T.U.C. on Friday, and he called for a united front on the Abyssinian situation of Jews, Mohammedans, Catholics and Protestants, and he felt sure that if such a united front could be achieved, then the war in Abyssinia will be stopped.

It won't be long before we are able to get these Labour leaders who want to bring such diverse elements as these in a united front to participate in a united front with I.L.P.'ers, Communists, etc.

We must remember this speech of Mr. Lansbury's because the argument is, that so long as there are certain fundamental differences between the Communists and the Labour Party there cannot be unity in any shape or form. Are no fundamental differences between those who embrace the faith of Mahommedanism and those who embrace the faith of Judaism?

[1] This, the concluding half of a shortened report of a speech delivered by Comrade Pollitt to the London District Conference of the Communist Party held to hear a report on the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. The first half of this was given in the October issue; it can be obtained for 7d. post free from THE LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 John St., London, W.C.1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We must learn how to utilise such statements as these in order to show the inconsistencies of the line of the British Labour leaders. Why? Because the British Labour leaders are the chief opponents of united action on a national and international scale. They threaten to leave the Second International, but the pressure for united action within the Second International has recently become so strong that it has been forced to agree that Adler and the Committee with him shall study the documents of the 7th Congress and will report at a specially convened Session of the Second International within two months as to the possibility of opening negotiations with the Communist International.

Comrades, if such negotiations can be established, from our side, we are confident that agreement can be reached.

Therefore in England we must now consciously follow the aim which can end in a common movement of those who want to see the realisation of that objective. What is this aim? What do we as communists look upon as our most important task? We defined it at the 7th Congress as follows. The principle task of the C.P. becomes clear. It is to stand out before every working man and woman in Britain as the initiator and leader of the fight to secure the defeat of the National Government, by the organisation of a broad united front movement based on a programme of demands which can and must be carried through by a Labour Government, which will strengthen the workers' immediate fight against capitalism and be a brake upon the advance of Fascism and War, and help the development towards socialism.

That in our opinion, is not only our principle task, it must become the objective of every worker in the Labour movement who is opposed to Mondism, Fascism and War. And we are sure that if the fight is carried on under the slogans "Down with the National Government," "For the preservation of peace, democracy, and the improvement of the conditions of the workers," we can bring about a tremendous change in the situation.

The defeat of the National Government has to be organised. It has increased its political influence to a very great extent since the Jubilee in May. Do not let us be under any illusion. It will increase its political influence as a result of its line at Geneva unless we are able to put the true position before the working men and women in this country.

When the result of the Peace Ballot was declared, I wrote an article in which I stated that every political party in Britain, above all the National Government, will seek to put this desire for peace behind their Party aims and to utilise it as support for itself and help to secure victory at the coming elections.

That is why the Labour Party and T.U.C. line is now so dangerous in regard to the Abyssinian situation. This refusal to expose the National Government, this refusal to expose the imperialist aims of the National

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government, is putting the National Government in a position where it can pose as the champion and defender of peace in Abyssinia and in this way deceive many big sections of the working class and the middle class that it must have a continuance of power to carry out its work for peace.

Do not let us forget the other thing. There is not all the keenness of the Labour Party to-day for a Labour Government that there was a few short months ago. Anyone who has noted the *Daily Herald* and contrasted the *Herald* in the campaign for socialism that the Labour Party previously carried on, the contrast strikes very forcibly.

The Labour leaders do not want power at the next General Election in the present international situation, because they know perfectly well that the masses to-day will never be deceived again as they were in two previous situations. The masses will demand some improvement in their material conditions. They know to-day the masses will demand an end to our foreign policy of support to Hitler. The masses will demand closer and closer relations with the Soviet Union. In this situation the principle leaders of the Labour Party are not desirous of getting power at the next General Election, but the working men and women of this country dare not contemplate the National Government getting a new lease of power at the next General Election. Because a Government such as we have now which is not a fascist government, but which is a government whose legislation has fascist tendencies and takes us on the road to fascism, this Government, given a new lease of power, by its attacks on the working class on the one hand and its foreign policy on the other, will place us in the most desperate situation.

We need now to raise this slogan : " Down with the National Government," and what can we put in its place ? I read an article in the *New Leader* some weeks ago headed " Baldwin, Maxton, Lloyd George," and the editor of the *New Leader* permitted himself to leave out any reference to the Labour Party because they did not count. The overwhelming majority of the masses of this country who are organised in the Co-operatives, the Labour Party and the Trade Unions are still under the influence of the Labour Party. It is not Maxton they see, it is not Baldwin they see, it is not Pollitt they see, it is the Labour Party they see, and the possibilities of a Labour Government, and the sooner we recognise that the better.

We have to learn how to organise all of the intense hate of the masses for the National Government, and harness it in a movement that will drive the National Government from power. A Labour Government elected in these circumstances faces a new political situation. Germany, Austria—has not been lost on the British workers. Spain has not been lost on the British workers. Reformist leaders are still strong, but class consciousness is still deeper in Britain than ever before. And are we now to believe that all this will disappear in a general election ?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If we can force the return of a Labour Government it is bound to try to do something in the interests of the proletariat. If it fails to do these things because of the attack on the vested interests of capitalism there are hundreds of thousands of British working men and women whose eyes will be opened to the real character of the capitalist State who will take extra parliamentary action. If we have as a result of the next General Election such a Government repealing the Trades Union Disputes Act, only to mention one little thing, to mention it because the miners are preparing for battle, because the miners are preparing for a national strike. The history of the industrial movement shows that when we have a miners' strike we have a political crisis in this country, and the Trades Disputes Act's repeal will be a valuable factor to help the Labour movement as a whole to come behind the miners' struggles. If we get the identification of a Labour Government in this country to a similar pact with the Soviet Union as exists with France, do you think Hitler would not have to take note of that, and Mussolini would not take note of that ?

Such a Government can be a brake upon the advance of Fascism and War, as a result of the work the I.L.P. and the C.P. will do to increase the political class consciousness, therefore it is one of the most important things we have to understand at the present time.

How will the C.P. approach the question ? We are proposing to the Labour Party quite definitely that in order to prevent one working class vote being split in this country we are prepared to withdraw a considerable number of our candidates, if the Labour Party will withdraw their candidates against our comrades. We would like to be able to convince the I.L.P. of such a policy of jointly approaching the Labour Party for such a demand.

We make a lot of mistakes, but when we say our Party will go into action, it works. We are also prepared to go further. As a conscious stepping stone first towards bringing about the maximum of unity of action to defeat the National Government, and secondly, towards the realisation of the perspective of one working class Party in Britain, we are prepared to become an affiliated body of the Labour Party. Does this mean that we are prepared to be an affiliated organisation from the point of view that we argued this in the years 1920 to 1923 ? The situation is entirely different. In those years we did not have the perspective of a united working class party in this country.

We are prepared to go into the Labour Party as an affiliated organisation retaining our identity as a party, and we will loyally carry out every decision that is reached, as a result of our participation, that corresponds to the interests of the working class. In the Trade Union movement when we are defeated by majority votes in the unions we will accept such decisions, but we will continue with our propaganda and education to try and win the workers on to our side. We have to have a line of Trade

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union unity in this country. The argument is all too common that the Trade Union movement is already united. Ours is the most split Trade Union movement in the world. A year ago at the Weymouth Trades Union Congress it was said that the time had come for us to unite in order to fight the wage reductions, but nothing has been done.

In Lancashire there are 36 different Weavers' unions. In the Engineering and Shipbuilding trade there are 51 different unions. The Miners have their District Unions. Therefore the struggle for unity of the Labour movement is a struggle also for unity inside the Trade Union movement. The telegram received at the Trades Union Congress from the Russian Unions, from 19,600,000 trade unionists, said they were confident that the British Trade Unions would play a rôle in unification against Fascism and War. This is a very important thing, and if we can get the Russian and British Trade Unions together by whatever steps, it can lead perhaps to the coming together of the two Trade Union movements, which can bring about on an international field the embracing of the two Trade Union movements, and for one International that embraces every trade unionist in the world.

We have to organise the unorganised in the trade union movement. In Sheffield yesterday I was asked whether we were in favour of having a strike to force men into the unions. Every time and any time. By all means do everything you can in order to win the unorganised man and make him a trade unionist. A certain type of worker wants to come in at first ; concentrate our best forces on him so that he can become the best advocate of what a trade union stands for. We say this because we are accused of being the splitters and disrupters. The majority of members who win T.U.C. recruiting medals are party members.

All this talk about disruption, all this talk about splitters—we are against disruption, we are against Mondism, we have been opposed to it since 1928. We are for the unity of every man in the trade unions—one trade union centre to embrace not $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions, but 10 million unionists in this country, and it can be done. We must get out to the masses. Therefore the 7th Congress decisions on these questions of unity must be widely made known to help bring about unity in action as the stepping stone to complete unification.

Changes have been made in the composition of the E.C.C.I. The leadership of the C.I. is going to be stronger than ever before, because men are now coming into it who had a leading rôle in the building up of Socialism, but who could not be spared before as the first job in Russia was to build Socialism. Comrade Dimitrov, the general secretary—at the head of the C.I.—stands as the incomparable fighter and leader against Fascism and War.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just as the C.I. has changed and strengthened its leadership, so every country in the world will have to do the same. We must have comrades who are not afraid to plunge into the stream, who when they take a dive do not want to be surrounded by all the lifeboats so that they should not sink.

Finally, comrades, we can speak with pride of the fact that at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International there was not one commission that had to be appointed to consider any internal quarrels or dissension in the Communist Party. There were comrades from Germany, facing gaol and death, comrades from Japan, giving us living examples of what the struggle against fascism means, comrades from all the British Dominions, all taking part, giving their experiences, and out of these experiences was born the line as laid down at the Congress that was received amidst scenes of enormous enthusiasm. Why was the line received with such enthusiasm? Because everyone knew it was the correct reply to the demands of the situation, and the demands of the masses themselves, and we therefore hope that the comrades here will support the line the Congress laid down. To those of you, comrades from the Labour Party and the I.L.P., we will undertake to supply your organisations with any of our comrades who will help you in intimate forms of discussion. This is possible and necessary in order that the masses everywhere shall know what the Seventh World Congress stands for. We were never more confident that the comrades will carry out this line and in three months from now, particularly in Germany, Poland, Japan and Italy, this line of the Seventh World Congress is going to lead to enormous changes in the class struggle.

Why have we made this change? because we want to stem the advance of Fascism and War, and because, as Comrade Dimitrov said in his concluding remarks, "We want all this because only in this way will the working class at the head of all the toilers, welded into a million strong revolutionary army led by the Communist International and possessed of so great and wise a pilot as our leader Comrade Stalin, be able to fulfil its historical mission with certainty, to sweep Fascism off the face of the earth, and together with it, Capitalism."

We here in Great Britain, assisted by the leadership of the Communist Party and C.I., pledge ourselves to make our great objective the achievement of our aims within the shortest possible space of time.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A DECISIVE STEP TO WORLD TRADE UNION UNITY

By W. ZAK

"We no longer hope for trade union unity—it is a reality."
(*Racamond, Secretary, C.G.T.U.*).

"I greet this first hour of the reconstitution of the old C.G.T."
(*Jouhaux, Secretary, C.G.T.*).

AT a time when the blackshirted hordes of Mussolini are carrying out their murderous aggression against an unarmed independant African people, the question which is on the lips of every member of the working class is: What is the most effective way in which the Fascist attack on Abyssinia can be stopped? While much can be done to preserve peace through sanctions carried out by the League of Nations, it is clear that this is not "War on War." "War on War" means independant working-class action, and places the question: how is this action to be carried out? For class action to be effective, for class action to meet with the greatest possible success, it must be carried out by the class organisations of the workers, by the organisations in which are the great mass of the workers, which can take such action at the point of production —the trade unions. Such class action by the trade unions must be carried out in every country, right throughout the world, under the guidance of an international trade union centre, and therefore the question of effective class action to stop the aggression against the Abyssinian people, of preserving world peace and defending the Soviet Union raises with all urgency before the trade union movement the question of immediate international trade union unity.

In this respect once again it is the French working class that has set the example to the working-class movement of all capitalist countries. Side by side with such dates in the revolutionary history of France as 1789, 1848, 1871 and 1919, there will remain in our memories three dates in recent years: February 12, 1934, when in united ranks the workers of France beat back the onslaught of Fascism; July 14, 1935, when the mighty Popular Front of the toilers of France was finally sealed and in their hundreds of thousands the workers, peasants and petty bourgeoisie of France came out into the streets for "peace, bread, and liberty"; and finally, September 27, 1935, when in the *Palais de la*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mutualité the delegates of the trade union centres of France, the *Confederation Génèrale du Travail* (C.G.T.) and the *Confederation Génèrale du Travail Unitaire* (C.G.T.U.) met together in a great and symbolic joint session to give effect to the decision of both of their congresses to reconstitute the old united C.G.T.

It is with this last date especially which we wish to deal at present in relation to the whole problem of international trade union unity ; though, in reality, it is difficult to separate any of these three dates one from the other. After the ranks of the French trade union movement had been split for over 14 years the congresses of the two C.G.T.'s during these three momentous days of September, discussed and decided upon a basis of unity following a series of lengthy negotiations. The split in the ranks of the French trade union movement arose as a direct result of the collapse of the leaders in 1914, when they had turned into " soldiers of liberty," and had placed the French trade union movement at the service of French imperialism. The war over, these leaders crystallised their betrayal by placing their services and those of the trade union movement at the disposal of the " general interests of the nation," in their abandonment of the class line of the trade unions, in their adoption of class collaboration, in their policy of reformism without reforms.

The crisis, following on the demobilisation of the troops, led to a rising cost of living, which brought about discontent among the trade unionists who wanted work and decent living conditions. Strike movements spread, but these were sabotaged by the leaders in pursuance of their policy of " peace in industry." At the Congress of the trade union movement in Lille in July, 1921, came the clash between the leadership, with its policy of class collaboration, and the opposition, which stood for a class policy for the trade unions. The leadership mustered 1,572 votes for its policy, as against 1,325 in support of the opposition. Immediately following the congress the revolutionary elements, including whole unions and districts, were expelled and the French trade union movement became rent from top to bottom.

These expelled unions and elements came together and formed a revolutionary trade union centre, the *Confederation Génèrale du Travail Unitaire*, which at its inception had strong anarchist tendencies, later affiliating to the Red International of Labour Unions. As early as 1923 the C.G.T.U. proposed to the reformist confederation a joint congress for the establishment of unity. In 1927 they even expressed their readiness to re-enter the C.G.T. on condition that trade union democracy was guaranteed. But all these proposals were of no avail. Nevertheless, the C.G.T.U. continued untiringly in its efforts to re-establish trade union unity. As the crisis developed and it became more and more evident that the split in the ranks of the trade union movement was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enabling the employers and the Government to impose worsened conditions upon the whole working-class the revolutionary centre redoubled its efforts for unity. In 1931 the Congress of the C.G.T. once again adopted a resolution declaring that unity could only be achieved inside its ranks and called for the unconditional disbanding of the C.G.T.U., this resolution being again reaffirmed at its 1933 Congress.

On the other hand, the C.G.T.U. Congress in 1933 adopted a resolution calling on its members :

> Resolutely and unhesitatingly to take the lead in the movement for unity, not in a sporadic fashion, but unceasingly ; and actively to work for the realisation of trade union unity by organising the work in common action in defence of their wages and for their other demands.

It was on the basis of the above resolution that the revolutionary trade unionists developed their action in the shops, depôts and mines, in the branches and the districts for the defence of working-class conditions and for trade union unity. As the economic crisis intensified and the menace of Fascism grew, with the introduction of the Decree Laws by the Doumergue Government, so the rank and file of the two confederations came together, along with the members of the independant unions in strike struggles, in demonstrations and struggles on the streets. In this way the barriers against unity were broken down and the lessons of Germany and Austria were learnt, so that a united front in action was built up to beat back the advancing Fascists of de la Rocque and Co.

While the rank and file of the revolutionary unions were giving effect to the resolution adopted at their congress, the Executive Committee of the C.G.T.U. untiringly repeated its efforts to get a basis for united action with the C.G.T.

Finally, a first meeting between the delegations of the two confederations took place in October, 1934, and negotiations continued until the two congresses came to an agreement for unity in September this year. During the whole of this period the revolutionary trade unionists kept up a continuous effort to establish unified unions wherever it was possible. Such unions became established mainly among the railwaymen, but also among the postal workers, the teachers and public employees.

It was in these conditions that the congresses of the two C.G.T.'s met in Paris at the same time and with practically the same points on their agendas. Both congresses were confronting the same problems : how best to fight against the attacks of the Government and the employers upon their wages and conditions ; how best to preserve peace and defeat Fascism. Both congresses decided that the most powerful weapon the working class could have in its hands was a united trade union movement. That the resolutions adopted on unity by both congresses and which were practically identical in their wording, were not just empty phrases, but embodied the determination of the membership of both

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confederations for unity was made clearer than any words could express in that historic and moving joint meeting. Here the delegates of both congresses, fraternally intermingled, greeted with the *International* the appearance of the bureaus of both confederations on the platform and continually applauded the statements both of Racamond and of Jouhaux, a significant sentence from each of which we have put at the head of this article.

It is because the rank and file of the French trade unions have learnt the bitter lessons of a divided trade union movement, of the havoc created by class peace, of the experiences of the working-class movements of Germany and Austria, that they have seen that every obstacle to the unity of the trade union movement had to be brushed aside. Their decision that from January 1, 1936, there shall be but one trade union ticket is of such importance to the working-class movement of the world that it bears repeating time and time again. The immediate result of this decision does not simply mean that the membership of the two confederations will now form one block, it means much more than that, and already at the joint meeting at the *Mutualité* the chairman read a letter from the powerful independant union of civil servants greeting the fusion and declaring its willingness to take part in it. Further, to this there can be no doubt that there will be a tremendous influx of unorganised workers into the unified unions. Our French comrades told us that they did not simply expect to have a confederation grouping a million trade unionists at the beginning of next year, but that they were convinced that within a very short time there would be at least two million members in the ranks of the unified confederation. At the same time, not only would the influence of the trade union movement be increased in the industrial centres, but it would exercise a tremendous influence over the peasant masses of France who are of so great importance. To have achieved this, to have placed such a powerful weapon at the disposal of the French working class in its fight for "bread, peace, and liberty," our comrades added, no concession had been too great.

The class struggle is not something which exists in one capitalist country and not in another. The class struggle is something which is common to every country where the exploitation of man by man exists, where there are exploiters and exploited, and therefore class action in the defence of working-class conditions is something which is needed in every capitalist country, and internationally it can only be carried out effectively by the existence of a united trade union international.

Conscious of this, conscious of the defeats inflicted upon the working class in recent years because the ranks of the trade union movement are divided, the revolutionary trade union movement, the Red International of Labour Unions, has repeatedly approached the International Federation

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Trade Unions with a view of getting joint action, with a view of realising international trade union unity. At the time of writing this article no positive step forward has been made in this direction. The I.F.T.U. has stated that the only basis for unity is that :

> The foundation for the reconstitution of Trade Union Unity shall be recognised to be the International Federation of Trade Unions.

For the I.F.T.U. to place the question in such a way is a little too simple. They seem to ignore the existing situation, they place the problem as if it were just one of book-keeping, one of procedure, and they therefore solve the question mechanically, not taking into account the fact that international trade union unity is to be won in action, nationally and internationally, in the fight against the workers' common enemy, against Fascism and against war. The I.F.T.U. in fact, says : " You want unity ! Well we existed first so disband your unions and come into ours and unity will be achieved." The I.F.T.U. does not seem to take into account that there are in its midst but a small proportion of the trade unions of the world. It seems to forget that it has never paid much attention to the colonial countries and has very little contact with them. It seems to ignore that the Red International of Labour Unions has in its midst the powerful Soviet Trade Unions with their 19,500,000 members, as well as the trade unions of Soviet China, that it has also powerful revolutionary trade union centres in many European countries, as well as having a great influence in the colonial countries. Then besides the unions organised in the two trade union internationals, there are those powerful trade union organisations which are not affiliated to any international, such as the Mexican Trade Unions, the trade unions of Brazil, Argentine and Paraguay, which are greatly influenced by the R.I.L.U. Further, there is the American Federation of Labour, the Australian unions and the Spanish anarchist unions, which are not affiliated to any international.

In such conditions it is impossible to approach the question of international trade union unity in the mechanical way which the I.F.T.U. has approached it in the past. That trade union unity can be achieved in all " sincerity and genuine goodwill " on the basis of trade union democracy has been proved by events in France, which have been dealt with at length, and by the agreement for partial trade union unity arrived at some time ago in India. In both cases the R.I.L.U. has given every assistance for the realisation of this unity which is so indispensable. Perhaps in this connection it will be of interest to quote the telegram sent by Lozovsky, General Secretary of the Red International of Labour Unions to the French trade unions immediately following the news that trade union unity had been realised in France :

> The R.I.L.U. greets with profound satisfaction the realisation of trade union unity in France, which will ensure a more effective struggle

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> for the immediate demands and final objectives of the French proletariat and be a powerful stimulant for international trade union unity.

The sincerity with which the Red International of Labour Unions and the revolutionary unions of the various countries are striving for national and international trade union unity is something which no one can deny. The sacrifices and concessions that they have been prepared to make to achieve that unity which will enable the working class successfully to combat the employers and their governments, to fight against war and Fascism have now become historic facts. Yet much remains to be done and the situation every day becomes more urgent. The British trade union movement is in a position to play an extremely important rôle in the achievement of international unity. In the past it has been the greatest force in the International Federation of Trade Unions opposed to unity. The reception given the telegram from the All-Central Council of the Soviet Trade Unions by the delegates at the Margate Trades Union Congress, the reply unanimously sent by Congress, as well as the statements made by Bromley, Marchbanks, Little, and others, give us every reason to hope that this attitude will be changed in the months ahead. At the same time of no little importance is the statement made on September 27 by George Hicks, member of the General Council, to the representative of *l'Humanité* following the joint meeting of the delegates in Paris, to the effect that he :

> Was deeply impressed by the unanimity of the delegates and by their enthusiasm for unity. I was struck by the speeches of Racamond and Jouhaux, and I profoundly agree with the sentiments expressed by both of them. *It is only by unqualified unity that we can effectively combat war and Fascism.*

Yet it is impossible to leave the question of trade union unity in the hands of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress without doing anything in the shops and branches, on the District and Executive Committees of our various unions. Experience has shown in France that it is only by the work of the rank and file, to which Racamond paid a glowing tribute at the *Mutualité*, that it has been possible to realise trade union unity in France. In the same way it will only be by the rank and file union membership of this country voicing their deep-rooted conviction of the necessity of international trade union unity that it will be possible to ensure that the General Council's representatives on the I.F.T.U. do all in their power for the realisation of unity on an international scale, thereby forging the weapon of international class action which will not only enable the workers successfully to combat the exploiters to bring an end to imperialist war and the extermination of Fascism, but to march forward victoriously to Socialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COTTON and THE LEFT:

A Reply to the "Fascist Quarterly"

By WILLIAM RUST

THE campaign initiated by the LABOUR MONTHLY against Fascism in Lancashire has resulted in the development of an organised offensive against the Mosley organisation and a thorough refutation of Fascism's pretence to be the sponsor of a practical policy for cotton workers. The LABOUR MONTHLY Conference against War and Fascism was attended by 250 delegates from all types of working-class organisations including three Weavers' Associations, nearly ten thousand copies of the pamphlet, "Mosley and Lancashire," have been sold, and dozens of meetings have been held under the auspices of the Drive Out Mosley Fund. This fund enjoys the support of a large number of labour, trade union and religious leaders and has been energetically supported by the Communist Party in co-operation with the I.L.P.

In the light of this development it is interesting to examine what the British Union of Fascists has to say in an article published in the last issue of the *Fascist Quarterly* entitled "Cotton and the Left." The article purports to be a reply to the LABOUR MONTHLY, but in reality is mainly a dull repetition of their cotton programme, the worthlessness of which we have already shown. Of interest, however, is the utilisation of the T.U.C. Cotton Plan in a demagogic attempt to discredit Socialism, certain unintentional admissions regarding the essential anti-working-class character of Fascism and renewed efforts to juggle with economics.

The essence of the Fascist cotton programme, it should be remembered, is the claim that unemployment can be solved within the framework of the capitalist system by means of tariffs, quotas and prohibitions. Fascism, claiming to be practical, derides Communism as offering only the world revolution and attacks Labourism as meaning rationalisation and consequent less employment. But as we have previously demonstrated Fascism has nothing to offer even as a short term policy, the boasted practicability exists only in the heads of its authors.

If an attempt is made to force British cotton goods on India to the extent of another 500 million square yards, as Mosley proposes, it is quite certain that there will be resistance and boycott. Any move to cripple native industries will provoke an anti-British feeling which far from permitting an increased sale of Lancashire goods may actually force a decrease. Woe betide the Lancashire operatives if they are ever foolishly led into such a policy. Further, a drive against Japan in Empire markets

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can only lead to an intensification of the struggle in non-Empire markets, and more might be lost on the roundabouts than gained on the swings.

The *Fascist Quarterly* answers these practical objections to its practical policy either by silence or deceit. To the first objection it has nothing to offer except its "long-term Empire policy" of introducing a higher standard of life in Britain which will "spread outwards throughout the whole Empire." And this apparently is to be preceded by those larger doses of repression in India as demanded by the *Blackshirt* every week. To the second objection the Fascist "theoretical" journal returns the astonishing reply that only 25 per cent. of Lancashire *production* goes to foreign countries, and "it is better to protect and extend the 75 per cent. imperial trade."

This reply is truly astonishing because the question at issue is not Lancashire's production, but its *exports*. In actual fact the proportion of Lancashire exports going to foreign countries is no less than 45 per cent. and that figure is bound to fall if the 400 million square yards of Japanese goods were to be barred from India and forced to seek an outlet in other parts of the world. If the Fascists were honest they would ask if it is better to protect and extend the 55 per cent. imperial trade at the expense of the 45 per cent. foreign trade. Such a proportion puts the question in a quite different light.

Now let us turn to an unexplained change in the Fascist cotton programme. The point which formerly read:

> *Fascism will exclude Japanese cotton goods from India. This would provide Lancashire with a market of* 580 *million square yards, which would give employment to nearly* 30,000 *workers.*

now reads:

> *Lancashire to replace American by Indian cotton to the extent of at least* 1,000,000 *bales, on condition that India transfers her Japanese agreement to this country and excludes Japanese cotton goods.*

This change has been made in an effort to escape the criticism of the LABOUR MONTHLY showing that according to the Delhi agreement, concluded several months *before* the publication of the Fascist programme, Japanese exports had been fixed at a maximum 400,000,000 square yards per annum, and then only on condition that Japan purchased 1,500,000 bales of Indian cotton. Consequently it was bosh to talk about excluding 580 million square yards and childish to ignore the reciprocities of Indo-Japanese trade.

But nothing daunted the obliging Fascists quickly transfer the sale of Indian cotton to Lancashire, and hey presto, everything in the garden is lovely again. Incidentally, it should be noted that whereas the old programme promised to put an extra 1,080 million square yards of Lancashire cotton goods on the Indian market, the new version blandly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

raises it to 1,500 million without bothering to bring forward an atom of proof although as we have previously shown the exclusion of Japanese cotton goods from India would chiefly benefit the Indian mills as the Japanese goods are mainly low grade fabrics which can be produced much more cheaply in India than in Lancashire.

But leaving aside this aspect of the matter and also the fact that the excluded Japanese goods would re-appear on the world market, one can only express amazement at the frivolity of the Fascists in proposing as practical politics that Lancashire should go over to Indian cotton to the extent of one million bales per annum.

The post-war annual average of Indian cotton imported into Britain amounts to 200,000 bales, although this figure is now increasing. But there are at present limits to the increase as the short-stapled Indian cotton produces the coarser counts of yarn not suitable for the high quality Lancashire goods. And considering that so far it is just in the sphere of fancy goods that Lancashire has held its own it would indeed be most extraordinary to begin an experiment with unsuitable cotton.

In any case, as the Fascists themselves admit, there could be no large scale utilisation of Indian cotton without a complete reorganisation of the spinning section of the industry, without a change-over from mule to ring spinning. There is nothing new in this proposal which the exponents of rationalisation have been advocating for years on end (see Report of Labour Government's committee on the Cotton Industry, 1930). If ever carried out it would mean a big increase in unemployment, a wholesale substitution of men by women and further strengthening of the financiers' grip on the industry.

To such straits have the Fascists been driven. They rave about the wicked bankers and simultaneously propose to put industry more firmly within their grasp, they denounce the Labour Party's rationalisation policy and themselves advocate a most colossal rationalisation scheme !

The *Fascist Quarterly* does indeed feebly protest that " Fascism advocates high wages to build up the home market," but it goes on to rule out the Lancashire cotton workers because they do not manufacture for the home market ! They must wait until the overseas markets are restored.

This admission from the " theory " of Fascism has an interest wider than Lancashire. It is Fascism's declaration of opposition to increasing the wages of any workers engaged in the export trade until new markets have been captured and the Empire " insulated " against foreign competition. This is a " theory " which directly conflicts with the bread and butter needs of the workers, especially the miners' fight for an extra 2s. per shift, and which if followed out would mean wholesale wage cuts and a passive resignation of millions to dire poverty. This " theory," of course,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ignores the fact that the cotton employers, as well as the employers in all export industries, continue to make profits and that there are a whole host of parasites (bankers, speculators, middlemen, dividend drawers), who are sucking the industry dry. There is no iron law of wages condemning cotton operatives to the lowest level in the country; on the contrary, wages can be forced up at the expense of the cotton employers or the profits of the employers as a whole by a policy of resolute class struggle conducted by militant trade unions.

In fact, there is no alternative before the workers other than a complete submission to slavery, or a determined struggle for the maintenance and improvement of standards in the course of which their class strength will be built up, finally making possible the ending of capitalism and the establishment of working-class rule.

As if in confirmation of this wage cutting "theory" contained in the cotton article, the *Fascist Quarterly* also publishes a viciously anti-trade union tirade by the former Labour M.P., John Beckett. This renegade makes no bones about Fascism meaning the wiping out the present trade unions and their substitution by "made in Germany" models which, like the Labour Front, will be hand-rags of the Corporate State. But Beckett declares for a truly majestic equality:

> In the Corporate State neither strikes or lockouts will be permitted.

The assurance that both strikes and lockouts will be prohibited resembles the law that prevents both rich and poor from sleeping under bridges and begging in the streets. If the worker is denied the right to strike, then it requires but little sense to see that the employer will not need the right to lockout. Workers who have no bargaining power and who must slavishly go on working, whatever conditions the employer forces on them, will gain but poor consolation from the knowledge that he cannot exercise the right to lock them out.

Unfortunately, it must be admitted that the proposals of the Trades Union Congress for the "Socialisation of the Cotton Industry" play into the hands of the Fascists and illustrate how Fascism feeds on the disillusionment caused by the official labour line. It is easy for the Fascists demagogically to denounce the T.U.C.'s scheme as nothing but rationalisation and the compensation proposals as meaning the creation of a "new class of compulsory parasites," although, of course, the Fascists themselves are the most fervent upholders of all the principles of rent, interest and profit. But the most dangerous feature of the T.U.C.'s scheme is the proposal regarding the rôle of the trade unions.

According to the T.U.C. the trade unions "are to exercise more responsible functions than is the case under private enterprise . . . a real co-partnership can be achieved" and the right to strike "must be reduced to the remotest possibility." In other words, the trade unions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are to become part of the machinery of a huge monopoly. Taking into consideration that the official policy of linking-up the trade unions with the state through such legislation as the legalisation of weavers' wages, has already resulted in wage reductions and the undermining of independent trade union action it is clear that the T.U.C.'s policy is not a mere academic point concerning a future Cotton Board. Its weakening effects are already being felt at this present moment.

In Lancashire to-day, one of the most urgent questions before the cotton operatives is the preservation of the independence of the Unions and their all-round consolidation by means of a recruiting drive, improvement of internal life and a vigorous amalgamation policy. Only in this way will it be possible to stem the tide of retreat and to advance to higher standards.

But this fight on hours, wages and conditions is not an end in itself. In the past the leaders of the cotton unions contented themselves with this narrow aim and ignored the approach of the inevitable decline of British Imperialism. To-day, having no vision of a future Socialist Britain and not understanding that a bold policy of struggle to maintain standards at the expense of employers' profits can be made an integral part of the fight to end capitalism ; the majority of those union leaders resort to the alternative policy of collaboration with the employers, hoping that a few crumbs will drop to the operatives from the ups and downs of the market.

The Fascists pretend that they understand the general causes behind the crisis and that they can be tackled by a " Long-Term Empire Policy," but this turns out to be just as shoddy as the " short term " policy which we have already exposed. All that is necessary is " to withdraw from the present dog-fight for world markets and build up a higher standard of life within our own ' insulated Empire.' " (*Fascist Quarterly.*)

Surely this is economic nationalism run absolutely mad ! According to the *Economist* (November 3rd, 1934), 63.1 per cent. of United Kingdom imports come from non-Empire countries and the percentage of exports to these is 58.2. The feather-brained economists of the British Union of Fascists are calmly proposing that the way to prosperity and higher standards is by " withdrawing " from nearly two-thirds of this country's foreign trade.

To these March hare politicians of the B.U.F. the statement that " the victory of the Indian and Chinese revolutions is the closest interest of the Lancashire worker " is only a matter for ignorant facetiousness. They are too much occupied with the acrobatics of political demagogy to grasp the realities of the colonial revolutionary movement, which however, are becoming more and more apparent to the cotton workers who have been the chief victims of the fifteen years of chronic crisis.

At a time when Socialism has achieved an irrevocable victory across one sixth of the world and when Soviet power has been established

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

across vast stretches of China, there is profound realism in the statement that Lancashire's interests are bound up with the colonial revolution. Not that the Communists " have little enough to offer Lancashire workers, except their part in world revolution " as the Fascists pretend. The policy of revolution consists not in the preaching of an aim, but in the conscious organisation of the working class forces and the tackling of the line of advance step by step.

The communists stand for the policy of united working-class defence and improvement of existing standards by the strengthening of the cotton trade unions and the development of mill organisation, for international solidarity with the object of raising wages in India, China and Japan, and in order to prevent undercutting. The communists are demanding that low textile wages shall be made up by public assistance committees, they are fighting for higher unemployment benefit and the abolition of the means test which has worked such havoc in the homes of the textile workers. The communists are, moreover, standing for the united working-class front, for the defeat of the National Government and the return of a fighting Labour Government which will, if necessary, allocate a subsidy for the improvement of textile wages and conditions.

These demands are part of the fight for the achievement of Soviet Power in Britain, which will signify the solution of all the basic problems of the textile industry even if it is not preceded by the colonial revolutions. The raising of the standard of life of the people of Britain would result in a considerable increase in the home consumption of textile goods, the elimination of the jobbers, brokers and middlemen would remove a big parasitic burden and the introduction of the seven-hour day would create more jobs.

Although no exact figures regarding the home market are available it is variously estimated that home consumption is now only about two-thirds of the pre-war level despite the increase in population. The scope for expansion at home is obvious and if the workers of Britain succeed in establishing really fraternal relations with the colonial masses and help them in their fight for a new life the problem before Lancashire will not be how to dispose of its product, but how to meet the ever-increasing demands. But whether historical development goes exactly along these lines or not, under a planned Socialist economy great plans of industrial reconstruction will be carried through and other industries will be open to those workers who to-day are condemned to the scrap-heap by the crisis of capitalism and the lopsidedness of Britain's industrial growth.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BACKGROUND TO THE CANADIAN ELECTIONS*

By CANADIAN OBSERVER

CANADA has this year been swept by a tremendous wave of mass protest against the economic conditions which are ever more rapidly pauperising whole sections of her 10½ million population. This protest has been canalized chiefly in the strike of the Relief Camp workers, although a number of industrial strikes and lockouts of prime importance have occurred. Of these strikes, some 90 per cent. have been led by the Workers' Unity League, revolutionary trade union centre.

To help us appreciate the significance of this strike movement a brief review of events leading up to 1935 is in order.

In comparison with many European countries, Canada has no great revolutionary tradition for, up to 1914, she had experienced no very serious capitalist crisis and her standard of living had steadily risen. During the war, therefore, parliament unanimously voted war credits and several hundred thousand men responded to the call for "King and Country," despite considerable but undirected resistance on the part of many sections of the Canadian people.

In 1917, however, general disillusionment set in and with it a great increase of revolutionary activity culminating in the Winnipeg General Strike of 1919 (Table II). "The strike was, in fact, an insurrectionary attempt to subvert the authority of our governments . . . . and to substitute for them an irresponsible strike committee, an attempt attended for a time with a measure of success which, looked at in retrospect, seems incredible." (Appeal Judge, Vol. 33, p. 19, Can. Criminal Cases.)

Canadian workers had tasted Soviet power. They will not quickly forget their Winnipeg Commune.

After this strike had been crushed, the Attorney General for Ontario declared that "the Communist menace is wiped out." Nevertheless, in 1924, the Communist Party of Canada was formed and *The Worker* first appeared as a small weekly. It is now a tri-weekly and will soon become a daily.

Following the period of comparative stability from 1921-29, during which strike struggles by no means ceased (Table II), the present economic

*This article was written before the results of the Elections were announced.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crisis was ushered in by the market crash of October, 1929. It is with this latter period (1930-35) that we shall deal.

R. B. Bennett, multi-millionaire financier, led his conservatives to victory over Mackenzie King's Liberals in August, 1930, having categorically promised to " end unemployment or perish in the attempt."

To help us understand Bennett's position on attaining power, statistics of external trade and unemployment (in trade unions only) are given below :

TABLE I.

Year.	External Trade $ (Add 000). Imports.	Exports.	Unemployment, percentage of, in trade unions.
1927 ..	1,030,893	1,267,573	4.9
1928 ..	1,108,956	1,250,598	4.9
1929 ..	1,265,679	1,388,896	7.15
1930 June	1,248,274	1,144,938	10.6—Av. 13.8
1930 Dec.			17.0
1931 ..	906,613	817,028	18.7
1932 ..	598,504	587,566	23.7
1933 ..	406,384	480,714	22.3
1934 ..	433,799	585,654	20.1

It will be seen that unemployment continued to rise despite Bennett and that its slight abatement in 1933-34 has followed the period of business upturn—actually a remnant of the old cyclical movement within the general crisis of Canadian capitalism. Further, these figures do not touch the great masses of Canadian workers outside the unions. The *Canada Year Book*, 1934, from which statistics here are taken, does not give direct unemployment figures. From the *Vancouver Sun* of February 26, 1935, however, we learn that 1,182,123 people, or 11 per cent. of Canada's population, were dependent on direct relief during 1934.

Nor are these the only statistics bearing directly on the present strike situation. During the past five years Canadian capitalism has greatly intensified its monopoly stage and has in fact become Canadian imperialism. Thus, between 1931 and 1934 the number of companies and persons paying income tax on incomes over $10,000 per year has been practically cut in half, while the total amount of taxes paid has scarcely diminished. Since the tax rate has not increased by an appreciable amount, this state of affairs means only one thing—that the wealth of the country is being concentrated into ever fewer and fewer hands. Whatever promises Bennett may have made regarding unemployment, he has beyond doubt seen to it that he, and the class of big imperialist exploiters which he so ably represents, have not (in a material sense) " perished in the attempt " to solve unemployment.

As regards " national defence," the costs of defending Canadian imperialism within and preparing it for war without, are illuminating. For the expenditures on the Royal Canadian Mounted Police have arisen from $2,900,000 in 1930 to $5,300,000 in 1934 ; and a " chain " of new armouries and airports costing millions is being built across the country.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

So much for the objective situation into which Canadian finance capital has led the country. We shall now survey the effects which these ever-tightening bands of exploitation are producing on the workers, and as an accurate general index of these effects we submit Table II. :

TABLE II.

INDUSTRIAL STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS.

Year.	Disputes in existence during the year.	No. of workers involved.	Time loss in working.
1918 ..	230	79,743	647,942
1919 ..	336	148,915	3,400,942
1920 ..	322	60,327	799,524
1921-29 (Av.)	95	27,357	725,902
1930 ..	67	13,768	191,797
1931 ..	88	16,738	294,238
1932 ..	116	23,390	255,000
1933 ..	125	26,558	317,547
1934 ..	191	45,800	574,519

Were the figures for 1935 available, we should certainly find a sharp rise in all three columns, for during the first seven months of 1935 a far greater number of strikes have occurred than in the whole of 1934.

In Eastern Canada workers in the lumber, mining, needle and sugar-beet trades have been bearing the brunt of this struggle. Particularly in mining and lumbering, where working conditions are abominable, has the greatest militancy been found. In most cases demands for shorter hours, better conditions and higher pay have met with success, but the fact has been repeatedly demonstrated that only through determined militant action can concessions be wrung from the bosses.

Now although in Eastern Canada a number of highly important strikes have taken, and are taking place, yet it has remained for the West (always more radical than the longer-established, conservative East) in general and British Columbia in particular, to produce the most intense and significant outbursts of class strife since the Winnipeg General Strike.

Vancouver, shipping and industrial centre for B.C. and a city with fully one-sixth of her 300,000 population on relief, is the hub of one of two major working-class movements concerning which mention must be made—the longshoremen's (*i.e.*, dockers and all port workers) lockout. A statement issued by the men themselves on June 4, the first day of the lockout, sums up the situation :

> The Vancouver longshoremen are locked out. This is the climax of two years' fight to stop the inhuman speed-up which caused the death of some 60 men in the last eight or nine years ; to stop the wholesale discrimination made through the employer-controlled hiring halls ; to stop the criminal attacks against working conditions . . . .
>
> Our refusal to handle unfair cargo has been taken as the excuse for a lockout. This is a deliberate attempt to smash the longshoremen's union here . . . . We warn the Government and the big shipping

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> interests that we will fight against this with every ounce of energy we possess. . . . . There will be no rioting so far as we are concerned.

The fight was on—Shipping Federation (employers) versus the strongest most revolutionary trade union in Canada.

No time was lost by Mayor McGeer, an open fascist, in lending the entire city police force to the Shipping Federation and in hiring machine guns, gas bombs and hand grenades. Federal and provincial police were also supplied in large numbers and armed with rifles, while to augment these a special force of 300 blueshirts were recruited by civic authorities. Barbed wire was thrown around many docks, scabs recruited and living quarters for them built. Almost daily the local press carried screaming, full-page advertisements—" communism gets in its deadly work," etc.—signed by the " Citizens' League," a fascist organisation of business men. Following a police-provoked riot which involved some 5,000 citizens, all picketing was declared illegal by the Chief Constable (who thus assumed the power of a legislature) and waterfront guards were strengthened.

Two more features of this lockout deserve mention. While support from all maritime unions on the coast and from French unions has been splendid, the attitude of certain leaders of some unions in the All-Canadian Congress of Labour is not healthy. In fact, these leaders are now following closely the disastrous line taken by officials of the British Trade Unions in 1926—the line of boss-collaboration.

Lastly, the lockout has an international aspect. Vancouver, in wartime particularly, is a key port on the Pacific. It is therefore in the interests of the bourgeoisie to smash any maritime union which might strike on the outbreak of war.

Whether the present attempt at smashing will succeed, only the future can tell.

III.

Important though the longshore lockout is as representing the struggle of Canadian *industrial* workers, 1935 has brought an even more vitally important struggle from the ranks of the unemployed. We refer to the Relief Camp Workers' Strike.

In 1931, Bennett began constructing forced labour (" relief ") camps at scattered points in the wilderness in order to drain the unemployed, especially the youth, away from dangers of city organisations. Faced with starvation if they did not obey, 20,157 men throughout the country went to camp under control of the Department of National Defence and were forced to work for 20 cents. a day. Unorganised and bewildered they remained in these semi-military slave compounds for four years. All organisation was flatly forbidden. " Committees or representatives

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appointed by the men will not be recognised as such—an appeal for redress by means of documents bearing the signatures of more than one man is forbidden."—(Department of National Defence Rules regarding complaints.—August 27, 1934).

But war office decrees could not stop discontent at the shocking conditions in the camps. As it grew, this discontent was canalized by some 90 to 100 communists (most of them members of the Young Communist League) who were in the camps, and after a preliminary strike in December, 1934, fully 2,000 men from the British Columbia Camps boarded the freights and converged on Vancouver, April 4.

Organised into divisions controlled by a democratically responsible committee, the strikers held an illegal tag-day which netted $5,600, overwhelming evidence of public support. Demonstrations and parades were held against semi-hysterical orders from the mayor (who thereby made a public fool of himself), culminating in what was almost certainly the largest May Day demonstration in Canadian history, a parade of 23,000 followed by a mass meeting of 35,000.

Despite almost daily " messages to the people from their mayor " throwing discredit on the strikers, public support held strong. In some instances vile implications were resorted to by McGeer-inspired press, *e.g.*, suggestions that many strikers suffered from venereal disease. It was at this time that the big business interests formed the Citizens' League. For all their " red menace " advertisements, however, they could not seriously deflect the people's sense of justice.

When funds ran low, strikers seized the public library and forced authorities to give them relief. It became apparent, however, that indefinite residence in Vancouver was impossible, for no action (save that of police) could be obtained from civic, provincial or federal governments, all of which passed the buck to each other in a ludicrous fashion. What could be done? With true working-class resourcefulness the strike committee sent out the call for an " On-to-Ottawa " trek, and on June 3, 1,200 men left by freight to lay their case before Bennett. During their two months' stay in Vancouver these men had collected some $22,000 and had left an indelibly favourable impression on most people's minds.

In the trek, working-class discipline attained magnificent proportions. The On-to-Ottawa march was no rabble. It was an army of trained and disciplined men, the majority of whom understood the reason for their social position and what must finally be done to rectify the situation.

Public support in prairie cities was tremendous, despite the red bogey. Prairie relief camps came out on strike and the trekkers' ranks swelled to 2,000. It was imperative to stop the march at all costs before it reached Winnipeg, where 13,000 citizens were demonstrating on the streets. Police and army reserves were concentrated in Regina and prevented the strikers from proceeding further east, but only after much brutality

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which culminated in a deliberate attack on a peaceful public meeting and the murder, by police, of one of their own detectives who was mistaken for a strike leader. It is reported that forty Royal Canadian Mounted Police refused to take part in this shambles.

Mass arrests followed under the anti-labour "section 98" passed after the Winnipeg strike, and a retreat was obviously needed. It was called, and Western strikers are now back in camp with their spirit unbroken and their determination to organise on a far larger scale undaunted. Widespread movements of men towards Ottawa in Eastern Canada and from Winnipeg continued, but organisation was poorer than in the West and although delegations have succeeded in seeing Bennett they have received personal abuse and the promise of "bullets, not bread."

What conclusions can we draw from this strike? There are three which plainly call for mention.

First: thousands of citizens have, during the past few months, been drawn into the class struggle, have seen for themselves the forces at work and have been obliged to choose one side or the other. As a result, whole sections of the population have swung sharply to the left and Communist Party membership has shown great increases. Contrariwise, of course, opposition to the workers has been crystallised into fascist organisations which, however, are not yet united into one political party.

Second: the rôle of all governments (Dominion, provincial and municipal) has been revealed to all with great clarity. People see that governments are not impartial referees, but that they, with their police, are the tools of ruling class reaction. This fact has long been apparent to class conscious workers by reason of anti-labour laws such as "Section 98," which takes away the right of free speech, but it is now realised on a far wider front.

Third: the workers taking part in the struggle have learned the value of militant organisation and of rigid discipline and now understand more thoroughly the rôle of the Communist Party in the class struggle.

By way of summary, we can say that a united front of the masses against the plainly increasing fascist menace is the most vital political question facing Canadians. If such a united front can be secured and made to embrace the trade unions, the drive to fascism can definitely be stopped. Indeed, unless such a front is achieved, unless the C.C.F.* and the broad working masses of the people come to realise the tragic results of continued popular disunity in the face of the capitalist offensive, then the victory of fascism in Canada is only a matter of time.

*The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, the equivalent of the Labour Party in England.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

on The Nature of the Capitalist Crisis

[In the July issue of the Labour Monthly a review by Emile Burns was published of John Strachey's "Nature of the Capitalist Crisis." It raised several points of theoretical importance which were taken up by Comrade Strachey in the September Issue. The controversy has given rise to further correspondence from readers of which the following is printed as of interest for the discussion.]

THE reply of Comrade Strachey in the September number of the LABOUR MONTHLY to the review of his book on *The Nature of the Capitalist Crisis* amply confirms the correctness of the criticism raised in the LABOUR MONTHLY review.

What is the basic point raised by Strachey? He says that we present a picture "of capitalism breaking down exclusively because of its inability to distribute enough purchasing power to clear the market of consumers' goods," and because of this we leave the gate "wide open to all those fatal illusions as to the possibility of reforming capitalism by making it pay higher wages." He further states "we may say that if capitalism did raise wages, it would run into crises by lowering the rate of profit," and then he asks "if it is not true that high wages would produce a crisis, what is the answer to reformist proposals for imposing high wages on the capitalists . . . . ?"

Where does Strachey get the conception that "we" (I presume he means here the Marxist-Leninists) present a picture of capitalism "breaking down" due to any "exclusive" reason whatsoever. This is a gross distortion of the teachings of both Marx and Lenin who tirelessly emphasised that capitalism does not "break down," but must be "broken up" by the revolutionary action of the toiling masses, led by the proletariat, which is destined by history to be the grave-diggers of the bourgeoisie. Neither Marx nor Lenin presented any single aspect of capitalism as the "exclusive" reason why capitalism must finally disappear as a social system. Lenin fought strenuously the theory of Rosa Luxemburg who maintained that capitalism would automatically collapse when no new colonies, and fresh non-capitalist countries, were available in which surplus value could be realised. Lenin also fought Kautsky's theory of organised capitalism as a reverse expression of Rosa's theory. Marx in Vol. III. of Capital very clearly states the internal contradiction which will cause capitalism finally to be displaced by a new social system. He says (p. 292): "The contradiction, generally speaking, consists in this, that the capitalist mode of production has a tendency to develop the productive forces absolutely, regardless of value and of the surplus value contained in it, and regardless of the social conditions under which capitalist production takes place." He follows this up by saying (p. 304): "The development of the productive forces is the historical task and privilege of capital. It is precisely in this way that it unconsciously creates the material requirements of a higher mode of production." Crises are the expression of this contradiction, and the explanation of crises cannot be found in wage changes, which are only a surface manifestation.

Marx and Lenin always emphasised that every tendency in capitalism produces its opposite, and that it is the contradiction and the struggle between the opposites that is the driving force in history, and in capitalist economy. Marx, for example, does not lay down an absolute law of the falling rate of profit, he calls it "the law of the falling *tendency* of the rate of profit" and shows in great detail the many counteracting tendencies which operate against the fall in the rate of profit. When Com. Strachey quotes from p. 295 of Vol. III. of Capital in order to show that Marx

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proved that high wages create a crisis, he committed a big error. If he had noted the qualification that Marx lays down on the preceding page where he says: "In order to understand what this over-accumulation is . . . . it is but necessary to *assume* it to be absolute" (my emphasis). But when Marx, for the purpose of developing an argument assumes it to be absolute, and clearly states it is an assumption made by him, this does not justify anyone in stating it to be absolute and using Marx as his authority. When Marx treats the law of value, he treats it as expressed in its pure form in a pure capitalist society, but he shows clearly enough that we do not meet these pure capitalist forms in actual life. Comrade Strachey has seized on an assumption made by Marx in order to illustrate the development of one single tendency within the capitalist system, and has converted this assumption into an absolute fact.

What is the logical outcome of this theory of Comrade Strachey, and if adopted by us to what results would it lead in practice? As Marxists, as communists, we would require to tell the workers that there is no use in fighting for higher wages, as this would lead to deeper crisis and a worsening of their position. We would also require to tell them not to heed any reformist leader who proposed fighting for an increased wage demand. Could any policy be more fatal to the revolutionary movement? It would mean the abandonment by us of the day-to-day struggles of the workers for wage improvements, and would mean our becoming a sect of "pure" theorists divorced from the masses, whom we would leave more closely shackled than ever to the chariot wheels of reformism. When we fight against the Living Wage theory of the I.L.P. and the Douglas Credit theory of to-day, do we oppose them on the ground that "if capitalism did raise wages it would run into crises?" Certainly not! We oppose them because they are utopian schemes ignoring the real content of the class structure of capitalist society, because they cover the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and hold out a utopia which has the effect of holding the workers back from immediate actions, actions which in practice would teach the workers the real essence of capitalist society. Are we confronted to-day by numerous demands on the part of the reformists for wage increases? No, on the contrary, every demand of the workers for wage increases is shelved by the reformists wherever possible. Our job is to encourage the pressure of the workers for wages demands, and by developing such wage movements thereby help to bring the workers to higher stages in the class struggle. By such tactics we win over to our united front those of the reformists who genuinely are endeavouring in their own way to fight for the workers. This tactic also exposes the open hostile enemies of the workers who are in the ranks of the reformists. The incorrect theory of Comrade Strachey would also hold the workers back from the elementary struggle for wages, and in practice would lead to the same results as the reformists and the Douglas Creditites against whom he is warning us.

Strachey, in my opinion, does not grasp what is the value of labour power, and I think this is the root cause of all his trouble. He says, for example, that in America "an important cause of the crisis was the bidding up of the price of labour power well above its value." Such an argument is in contradiction to the facts, so far as I can judge. In the first quarterly analysis in "Inprecorr" of 1930, Comrade Varga gives information in this respect, which is well worth noting. The following is an abridged extract from his figures:

	1923-24-25 (Average)	1928	1929
Index of wage total, U.S.A.	100	101.8	109.6
Index of output volume ..	100	111.0	122.0

Here we see that a growth of 11 per cent. and 22 per cent. in 1928 and 1929 is recompensed by a 1.8 per cent. and 9.6 per cent. growth in wages for the same years. Even if we admit that improved technique was responsible for a part of this growth in output, we must never forget that the basic feature of capitalist rationalisation is increased *intensity* of the labour process, and leads to a more rapid wear and destruction of the labour power

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the worker. Even before the war, "too old at forty" was a common expression denoting this fact, and to-day "too old at thirty" is common in American industry. A worker may receive higher wages for more intense work over a shorter number of years, and actually be getting a lower price (wage) for his labour power in comparison with its value than another worker who receives a lower wage, but who works less intensely for a longer period of years. It is also possible for a worker to be receiving wage increases at a period when the cost of living is falling, and yet at the same time he can be in a worsened position if we compare the price of his labour power with its value. The extra margin he is receiving may not cover the greater expenditure of energy on his part due to increased labour intensity, and may not be able to replace in full his expended strength and keep his labour power in a fit condition to compete on the labour market. We must remember that once a certain degree of intensity (or extension) of the labour day has been been reached, every little extra expenditure of labour wrung from him beyond that point increases the physical exhaustion of the worker in geometrical ratio and requires a correspondingly greater recompense for replacement. Quite often the increased exhaustion is so great as not to be replaceable by increased food, or better cultural or housing conditions, and leads to the physical breakdown and destruction of the labour power of the worker.

Strachey makes the further statement that American high wages "precipitated the crisis by eating into the rate of profit." The Labour Factbook (International Publishers, New York) on page 52 states: "Dividends of 1929 were higher than those of 1928. A group of companies tabulated by the New York *Journal of Commerce* and paying nearly 30 per cent. of the total dividends, showed an increase of about one-fourth in 1929 as compared with 1928." Another indicator we have that the rate of profit was rising and that it was not being eaten into by wages, as Comrade Strachey asserts, is the enormous increase in share prices at this period. As the price of a share is in practice only the capitalisation of the share of profits to which the share gives its owner a legal claim (just as the price of land is only capitalised rent), an increase in the price of shares is an indicator of an increase (or expected increase) in the amount of profit it will receive. The share boom collapsed when profits began to tumble, but the profits tumbled not because of wage increases leaving no margin for the poor capitalists, but because of the impossibility of disposing the commodities which the factories had produced. The factories were faced with the existence of over-production before this expressed itself in the share market.

Comrade Strachey thinks that, despite the existence of mass unemployment, capitalism is approaching difficulties through "no net annual increment of labour offering itself for exploitation." Here we have an obvious confusion of surplus population in its ordinary, everyday, grammatical meaning, of an increase in the number of people who live in a country with its strictly scientific meaning, as used in Marxian political economy, that is, a labour force which is surplus to the requirements of production. In the Soviet Union the population increases three millions annually at the same time as the labour force is being economised by all possible means through mechanisation of industry; yet there is no surplus, unemployed, labour force, which is unable to find a place in production.

Production in the Soviet Union is not limited by capitalist barriers, and the growth of population is not hindered by the operation of laws which only pertain to the capitalist system. In capitalist countries the surplus population is that surplus labour force which cannot be employed by capitalism and which grows steadily to ever greater dimensions, whether the total population of the country is growing or remaining stable. Capitalism is not troubled to-day by the problem of finding a labour force for its industries, it is more worried at the dangers which a too great surplus labour force present to it in the forms of the demands of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unemployed. Marx says in Vol. I. of *Capital*, page 691, Kerr edition: "The labouring population therefore produces, along with the accumulation of capital produced by it, the means by which itself is made relatively superfluous, is turned into a relative surplus population; and does this to an ever-increasing extent. This is a law of population *peculiar to the capitalist mode of production:* and in fact every special historic mode of production has its own special laws of population, historically valid within its limits alone. An abstract law of population exists only for plants and animals, and only in so far as man has not interfered with them."

Comrade Strachey, in postulating a danger to capitalism through a depleted labour force, has obviously ignored this specific law of population valid for capitalism. These are a few of the more obvious points on which the line of reasoning of Comrade Strachey is obviously incorrect, and he should seriously consider the danger of his position. Economists of the type of Hayek and Robbins, like all other apologist economists of the bourgeoisie, have nothing in common with Marxism, no matter how many points they have in which they seem to "approach" to Marxism.

"INTERESTED."

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED (continued from page 712).

New Propellor. No. 1. Vol. 1. Organ of the Aircraft Shop Stewards' National Council. 1d.

The Unity of Mankind. Morris Ginsberg, M.A., D.Litt. (Oxford University Press.) 29 pp. 2s.

Who's Who in Bristol. Labour Research Department. 27 pp. 2d.

My Little Russian Journey. Mrs. Gwyneth Foden. (Arthur H. Stockwell Ltd.) 37 pp. 1s.

Land of Plenty. A Play in Three Acts. Harold Holland. (Crossway Press.) 125 pp. 1s. 6d.

Soviet Prosperity. V. Molotov. (Martin Lawrence Ltd.) 95 pp. 1s.

Communism in the United States. Earl Browder. (Martin Lawrence Ltd.) 352 pp. 5s.

Mussolini Over Africa. F. A. Ridley. (Wishart Books Ltd.) 144 pp. 3s. 6d.

I Change Worlds. Autobiography of Anna Louise Strong. (Routledge.) 422 pp. 15s.

New Trends in Socialism. Edited by G. E. G. Catlin, with various contributors. (Lovat Dickson.) 293 pp. 5s.

Aircraft Manufacture. R. McKinnon Wood. (New Fabian Research Bureau.) 26 pp. 6d.

The Simple Case for Socialism. G. D. H. Cole. (Gollancz.) 288 pp. 5s.

A First Russian Reader. Anna H. Semenoff. (Dent & Co.) 119 pp. 3s. 6d.

Whither the Church? The Powers of Priesthood. Captain W. A. Powell. 26 pp. 6d.

Stalin. Henri Barbusse. (John Lane, The Bodley Head.) 324 pp. 12s. 6d.

The English Policeman, 871-1935. Alwyn Solmes. (Allen & Unwin Ltd.) 256 pp. Cloth, 7s. 6d. Paper, 5s.

Leisure for All. (London Social Credit Club.) 16 pp. 2d.

Housing Under Capitalism. International Pamphlets No. 4. Sidney Hill. (International Publishers, New York.) 39 pp. 6d.

Break Down. The Collapse of Traditional Civilisation. Robert Briffault. (Gollancz.) 288 pp. 7s. 6d.

Virgin Soil Upturned. Mikhail Sholokov. (Putnam.) 488 pp. 7s. 6d.

Abyssinia: 7th Impression. Revised and expanded. (League Against Imperialism, 53 Grays Inn Road, W.C.1.) 32 pp. 1d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

AN INDICTMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT'S HEALTH POLICY.

Public Ill Health. By C. E. McNally, Hon. Treasurer, Committee Against Malnutrition. Gollancz. 5s. net.

THE science of Nutrition, as understood to-day, dates from the profound work of Sir Frederick Garland Hopkins in his discovery of the "Vitamins" in the year immediately preceding the war. Since then gigantic strides forward have been made, to a considerable degree governed by the needs of the war (when the problem of maintaining the nutrition of nations on minimum diets became urgent) and the subsequent "Peace" (when the same problems continued at least for certain sections of the populace such as the unemployed).

To-day it can be said with safety that, great as are the gaps that still remain in our knowledge of this subject, the fundamental laws governing sound nutrition, the essential basis of sound health in a nation, are well understood and are capable of easy, immediate and practical application. "Then why are they not so applied?" is the question that must arise straight away in the minds of every sane thinking man and woman who concerns him- or her-self with health problems to-day. An attempt to answer this apparently simple question would immediately lay bare one of the clearest examples of the frustration of science by the stranglehold of monopoly capitalism. The immense knowledge of Nutrition now available *in theory* cannot be applied *in practice* because it would interfere with PROFIT. Foodstuffs there may be in superabundance; millions there may be in need of those foodstuffs. Scientists of profound knowledge and skill may be ready and willing to see that these foodstuffs are used by these millions under the most correct and satisfactory conditions; but—the foodstuffs must be destroyed and the millions go hungry so that "Prices may be kept up."

Such a complete divorce of theoretical knowledge from its only true testing and fructifying ground—its practical application to the satisfying of human needs, without which it becomes sterile or stunted itself—is producing, as is inevitable, lines of cleavage within the ranks of those working at this branch of science. Some of them, no longer able to confine themselves to a monastic scholasticism, nor willing to act as official apologists for a Government that is breaking every law of their science, are beginning to realise that science has a duty to perform in "transforming the world." And it is as an expression of this tendency, however unclear it may yet be, that this book under review is of profound importance.

The "Committee Against Malnutrition," a body of scientific and social workers having among its adherents many scientists of high importance in their subjects, is to some degree a result of the above process and concerns itself with the collection and distribution of data on the science of nutrition and the relation of this to Public Health. Mr. McNally, in his preface, specifically lays it down that the views expressed are his own and not those of the Committee but, as he has had full access to its material and discussions, it may be taken that there is no major divergence of opinion between them.

The attitude of the Government, expressed through the reports of Sir Geo. Newman in his capacity of Principal Medical Officer of the Ministry of Health, is one of complacency—that there has been no obvious deterioration in the standard of health of the mass of the population as a result of the economies effected during "the crisis." Line by line, word by word, this view is challenged by Mr. McNally with a mass of carefully collected and correlated facts to such an extent that the final conclusion in the mind of the critical reader can only be that the Government understands well a remark often used by the late Mr. A. J.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cook (" It may be true that figures cannot lie : but liars can figure ") and knows how to use it in covering up the results of its monstrous policies.

To measure a phenomenon is to compare its dimensions in relation to some appropriate scientific standard. To measure " nutrition " in a population (an essential precedent to deciding on the presence or otherwise of " malnutrition ") it is necessary to have a standard to work from. Let it be said immediately that there is no such standard at present known to science—and it follows immediately that the Government's figures (say of the standards of nutrition of school children) have no scientific meaning, if they do not (as is the case) lay down the standard on which they base their judgment. Such figures are merely a hotch-potch jumble, drawing together the subjective impressions of a large number of independent observers (the School Medical Officers) and, however careful and painstaking the latter may be, as such the figures are scientifically of very little value. It is this state of affairs which explains the apparent anomaly that malnutrition in a poor area is often returned as being about the same as that in a much wealthier neighbouring area—from which it is argued that the working classes are not suffering in health as a result of wage cuts, etc. The truth lies in the fact that, in the absence of a standard of judgment, the medical officer may return as " good " the nutrition of a child in the poor area while his colleague in the wealthier area would immediately label it as " poor " (*i.e., for his area*). This point is dealt with fully and adequately by Mr. McNally. He argues, and rightly so, that in the absence of any agreed system of measurement of the finer degrees of malnutrition (as opposed to obvious gross starvation), the only rational method of assessing its presence is to put those under observation on OPTIMUM diets and note results. If there is improvement in weight, height, blood, general bodily tone, etc., then it is clear that malnutrition must have been present earlier.

Such a process is an impossibility for any Government *under capitalism*. Yet wherever tests of this sort have been applied, even in limited fields, they have immediately yielded direct evidence of malnutrition. One example of Mr. McNally's will illustrate the point :—" The physical development of boys of 15 years of age in four well-known public schools was compared with that of boys in a South London riverside district. The public school boys were getting about half as much food again, and in a more nutritious form. The result of the comparison was to show that the latter were on an average 15—20 lbs. lighter than the former."

Step by step Mr. McNally builds up what is, whether so intended or not, a biting indictment of the results on health of the policy of the British capitalist class. Children, Maternal Mortality, Tuberculosis, the Unemployed—these are some of the chapter heads which indicate how the problem is approached. The style is simple and easily intelligible to the average reader and the approach objective and not propagandist. The book altogether is an invaluable mine of information for anyone active in the labour movement and its material should be scattered broadcast to move the masses to a sense of danger so far as their health and well-being is concerned.

" M. D."

ENTHUSIASTIC BUT STILL LACKING UNDERSTANDING

Literature. By Philip Henderson. (John Lane.) 3s. 6d.

THIS book attempts a survey of literature, and especially English literature, from the earliest beginnings up till to-day, from the standpoint of historical materialism.

It is written with enthusiasm for Marxism and its application to literature. A resulting freshness of statement is one of the good features of the book. Also valuable are the little known quotations illustrating the revolt and hardships of the peasants under feudalism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The book has, however, serious weaknesses. The standpoint of historical materialism is often abandoned, either in favour of an explanation in terms of individual characteristics (" it happened that Paul was a fanatical ascetic, a man with a violent sex-recoil," p. 13, is given as the reason of the attitude of Christianity towards sex) or of an arbitrary reasoning only from climatic conditions direct to literary expression without any regard to the essential intervening factors of social activity and to the stage of social development (a poem like Beowulf differs " from the Greek legends . . . by the heavy grey skies " (p. 18)).

The historical materialist standpoint is not thoroughly applied, for there is no exact description of the means and conditions of production at any given stage, still less any analysis of the simultaneous action of more and less advanced means and conditions. In as far as the social and economic basis is sketched in, too much emphasis is laid on the condition of the market and circulation (the author stresses chiefly the influx of gold in the Elizabethan period and the possibility of profit at the time of the industrial revolution).

The treatment of the class war is also unsatisfactory. In the feudal period the author gives great space (relative to the scope and size of the book) to the position of the peasants, but treats the conflict between feudal and bourgeois influences very lightly. Although it is necessary to show the exploitation basis both of feudal and bourgeois literature, yet till well after the bourgeois revolution the class war between feudalism and bourgeoisie is more important for the understanding of literary trends and individual authors than the revolts of the exploited class, the time for whose revolution had not yet come.

On the other hand, when it does become necessary to emphasise every single expression of the growing power of the proletariat, the author goes silent. Neither Chartism nor Chartist literature are mentioned. Dickens appears—in one short paragraph—as a man who wrote out of fear of poverty, revealed something of the appalling squalor of " the lower stratas," but is difficult to read for a generation nurtured on Shaw, Lawrence and Huxley (p. 83).

That is, I think, a revealing passage. These authors are still probably Mr. Henderson's unconscious standards of judgment. As long as they are apparently not at stake, he concentrates on the literature of revolt. When they are directly at stake, he unconsciously dries up on the subject of revolt.

This is also connected with an insufficiently historical treatment. Mr. Henderson can stress the literature of revolt in feudalism with facility, because he has not actively assimilated the literature of the court and scholasticism nor actively realised how this literature is carried forward by the literature of the bourgeoisie and now by the rising literature of the proletariat. Not realising how his own literary standards are inconceivable without the literature of the past, he can write of it in a tone which has more than a suspicion of " debunking " it by contrast with the literature of the exploited class. He thus avoids the most difficult and fertile question of Marxist criticism—the value for us to-day of a past literature written by an exploiting class.

The unconscious bias in favour of writers like Huxley, the lack of historical treatment—these are the underlying reasons of the abandonment of the standpoint of historical materialism already mentioned. And they are the reasons of such astonishing sentences as the following: " In such countries as these (Germany and Italy), if anywhere, can be witnessed Spengler's decline of the West " (p. 157). It cannot; the West is not declining according to Spengler, any more than society is moving according to any other erroneous conceptions which its actual movement causes to be formulated. Mr. Henderson does well to insert " if anywhere " ; but that is a feeble way to bridge over the uneasy consciousness that in such passages he throws Marx overboard.

Mr. Henderson thus does not fulfil the promise of his opening sentences. We

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hope that his enthusiasm will carry him through the task of thinking through historical materialism and literature more thoroughly, and that he will then give us a better book, which we urgently need and of which he is surely capable.

ALICK WEST.

HOUSING IN MANCHESTER.

The Rebuilding of Manchester. E. D. Simon and J. Inman. Longmans. 5s. 173 pages.

BY far the most interesting part of the work is contained in the valuable information given in regard to the housing shortage and slum problem in Manchester.

Though the author informs us that the Manchester City Council is among the more progressive of the City Fathers of the country, nevertheless, the centre of that city is barricaded around with a two mile belt of slums.

In the slum belt there are 80,000 houses. The Medical Officer of Health for Manchester has condemned, as unfit for human habitation, 30,000 of these. But, say the authors, "the remaining 50,000 are of a similar type and cannot be brought up to modern standards by reconditioning, in our opinion the only way to deal with them is to demolish them" (pages 66-67).

Overcrowding grows in spite of all measures to prevent it and the book gives some interesting facts about the disgusting conditions under which Manchester workers have to live. This state of affairs has been intensified by the Slum Clearance Policy of the National Government who, while demolishing houses, are not providing new ones. As the authors say, "Since 1933, however, as a result of the change in the policy brought about by the National Government, the City Council have for the present given up the building of additional houses . . . the Council's hands have been tied by the Government" (page 67).

The authors are sincere Liberals who have a real desire to see nice cities and properly housed people. They find the Housing problem a hydra-headed monster under the present social system, and bring further evidence to bear out the contentions of Engels that it is Utopian to attempt a solution of the housing question by isolating it from the basic cause, which is capitalism.

The interesting passages as to the difficulties in obtaining the land for the Wythenshaw Estate; the high land value of certain parts of the slum belt which make it difficult to rebuild on those sites, are dealt with by the authors and are telling examples of the fact that slums arise from capitalism and could never be entirely eliminated under this system.

Of the same nature is the valuable table prepared on page 116, which shows what has been the result with those who have been removed from slum clearance schemes :—

	Year	Able to pay.	Unable to pay.	No. of Investigations
Ancoats ..	1930	56%	44%	216
Hulme ..	1931	65%	35%	1072
Hulme ..	1932	42%	58%	186
Miles Platting ..	1933	49%	51%	159

This table shows that almost half the workers removed from the slum schemes cannot pay the new additional rents. The wage drives, increasing unemployment and attacks on Social Services are in the direction of increasing this poverty, and it is precisely this poverty of the masses which arises from capitalism which makes it impossible to do any more than tamper with the housing problem while the system continues.

Even the authors do not think that there is going to be any improvement or industrial expansion of capitalism because they plan on the basis of the lowering land values of the slum belt in the centre of the City. Well, if there is continued crisis in capitalism there is continued poverty and less money for rent. The authors consider subsidies should be given, and if they are it will be as a direct consequence of the mass struggle of the workers which will force such concessions from the Government.

On page 4 there is an interesting quote from Engels' *Conditions of the Working Class in* 1844. The authors should now

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acquaint themselves with Engels' *Housing Question*, which will tell them how the social revolution will solve such a question.

They can rest content in the knowledge that the architects who will rebuild Soviet Britain will no doubt use some of their ideas on the replanning of Manchester, building more and more Wythenshaws.

The book is very attractive and contains three useful maps.

E. R.

A STUDY OF AFRICAN DANCING.

Africa Dances. By Geoffrey Gorer. (Faber and Faber.)

THE contents of the book show mainly two aspects of the French West African colonies: firstly, the geographical, economic and political conditions, and secondly, the rites, customs and religions of the people with dancing as their chief form of expression. The author states that he had originally not wanted to deal with the former aspect, but was forced to do so by the difficulties placed in his way by the authorities in different parts in order to prevent him from seeing the most shocking conditions in the colonies. On these conditions he supplies some very good material. Having had his attention thus forced on to economic and social conditions, Gorer finds it necessary to give further economic and social details in explanation of the customs it was his primary object to describe. This shows how the historical materialistic position is forced by the actual conditions on an intellectually honest person; and Gorer is intellectually honest. But this standpoint being accepted more under the pressure of single facts than voluntarily and completely, the construction of the book becomes extremely weak; a continuous jumping from one aspect to another without always showing the connection between the one and the next.

Another deeper weakness is his belief that bad colonial conditions result from low wages and the insufficient education of the administrators and similar defects. This obscures the colonial question altogether: for if this were so, better administrators and a better government would suffice to make life for the inhabitants in colonial countries all right. The cure of the bad conditions would remain a purely individual and reformist one. This weakness in the conception prevents Gorer from finding a satisfactory explanation of a great many things seen on his journey. Further: when he attacks the terrible suffering of the natives through French imperialism and then comes to view English colonies, through a small part of which he travelled and where life seemed to him to be so much easier for the Africans the English reader will gather that English administrators are better educated and better men and that we can congratulate ourselves on our English colonies. But especially to-day one thing must be made clear: Whatever are the merits or otherwise of the English method of colonial exploitation as opposed to that of the French, fundamentally they are based on the suppression and exploitation

THE COMING WORLD WAR

By T. H. Wintringham

"Every important aspect of war is dealt with. It is thrilling to read, is argumentative throughout and is a most handy reference book for a thousand and one arguments that arise on the question of what attitude should a worker adopt to war."

E.W. in the Daily Worker.

5/-

WISHART & Co.

9 John Street, W.C. 2

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of one nation by the capitalists of another. Therefore their independence is the primary condition for the improvement of the conditions there, etc. The value of Gorer's book lies chiefly in the extremely rich, new and useful sociological material, as also in its intellectual honesty, but not in the explanation given of the observed phenomena.

W. F.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

Answer if You Dare. Youth Challenges the National Government. John Gollan. (C.P.G.B., 16 King Street, W.C.2.) 15 pp. 1d.

The Rebuilding of Manchester. E. D. Simon (Longmans.) 173 pp. 5s.

The Condition of Clerical Labour in Britain. F. D. Klingender. Preface by W. J. Brown. (Martin Lawrence.) 117 pp. 2s. 6d. paper, 3s. 6d. cloth.

Report of the Committee on the Organisation of Industry. June, 1935. (Federation of British Industries.) 16 pp.

Survey of Britain's Recent Commercial Policy. June, 1935. (Federation of British Industries.) 49 pp. 1s.

Jew Boy. Simon Blumenfeld. (Jonathan Cape Ltd.) 348 pp. 7s. 6d.

Cadres Decide Everything. Stalin's address to the Graduates from the Red Army Academy. (Martin Lawrence.) 1d.

Pamphlets on the New Economics: No. 10. *A Short Course of Economic History.* Helen Cerbe. 32 pp. 6d. No. 11. *The Society of Social Credit.* Maurice Colbourne. 32 pp. 6d. No. 12. *Essential Communism.* Herbert Read. 32 pp. 6d. No. 13. *The Soul of Man in the Age of Leisure.* Storm Jameson. 32 pp. 6d. *An Open Letter to a Professional Man.* Ronamy Debree. 30 pp. 6d. *The A plus B Theorem* H.M.M. 35 pp. 6d. *What is this Social Credit.* A. L. Gibson, F.C.A. (Stanley Nott Ltd.) 31 pp. 6d.

Mosley, Fascism the Man, His Policy and Methods. Labour Research Department. 16 pp. 1d.

You Cannot Kill the Working Class. Angelo Herndon: condemned to 8—20 years on the chain gang in Georgia for organising black and white unemployed to demand relief. I.L.D. and League of Struggle for Negro Rights. 30 pp. 3d.

Shovels and Guns: The Civilian Conservation Corps in Action. James Lasswell. (International Pamphlets.) No. 45. 23 pp. 2d.

A Handbook of Marxism. Edited by Emile Burns. (Gollancz.) 1,088 pp. 5s.

The Problem of the Far East. Sobei Mogi and H. Vere Redman. (Gollancz.) 352 pp. 5s.

Children and Young Persons under Labour Law. International Labour Office. (P. S. King and Son.) 342 pp. 10s. 6d.

Conveyor. James Steele. (Martin Lawrence.) 222 pp. 7s. 6d.

Schools at the Crossroads. Papers on "The English Schools in the Crisis: 1935," "Education Under Fascism," "Education in the Soviet Union." (Martin Lawrence.) 188 pp. 5s.

Men Adrift. Anthony Bertram. (Chapman and Hall.) 323 pp. 7s. 6d.

The Defence of Terrorism. L. Trotsky. (Allen and Unwin Ltd.) 176 pp. 3s. 6d.

Women in Soviet Russia. Fananina Halle. (Routledge.) 409 pp. 8s. 6d.

The Scientific Method of Thinking. Edward Conze, Ph.D. (Chapman and Hall Ltd.) 168 pp. 5s.

(*Continued on page* 706.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LAST BOOK BY

Henri Barbusse

STALIN

A NEW WORLD SEEN THROUGH ONE MAN

12/6

LISTENER : "A panegyric, partly of Stalin the man, but far more of the Communist party of which he is the head . . . . It is a brilliant, impressionist picture."

●

THE WHITE SEA CANAL : A group composition by 30 prominent Soviet writers, headed by Maxim Gorki. Edited by Amabel Williams-Ellis—This is the story of one of the most remarkable engineering feats of recent years ; it is also a literary experiment. **15/-**

THE NEW ROAD TO PROGRESS : by Samuel D. Schmalhausen. A study of the present position of psychology, in the light of modern social and economic problems. **15/-**

JOHN LANE, THE BODLEY HEAD

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WE ARE BUILDERS

In these days of economic stress the foundations of many old-established businesses are in danger. These should be strengthened by the latest known and proved methods.

Modern businesses need special care in building. Concrete is largely the outcome of science and intelligence.

Modern Publicity and Printing is the best form of concrete foundation for any business or Association.

WE ARE BUILDERS

LEICESTER
CO-OPERATIVE
PRINTING
SOCIETY LTD.
Church Gate, Leicester
LONDON: 68 Borough St., S.E.1

Published by the Proprietors, the Training Trust, 7 John Street, W.C.1, and Printed for the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Limited, 99 Church Gate, Leicester.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED